

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 32, NUMBER 3

JULY 1950

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JULY 1950

VOLUME 32

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 21

NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

CAMILO HENRIQUEZ: PADRE OF THE PRESS . . . <i>Irvin M. Lande</i>	131
CADILLAC, PROPRIETOR OF DETROIT <i>Jean Delanglez</i>	155
THE HON. CHARLES AUGUSTUS MURRAY AMONG THE PAWNEES: 1835 <i>W. H. G. Armytage</i>	189
BOOK REVIEWS	202
NOTES AND COMMENTS	207

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA
W. EUGENE SHIELS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON
PAUL KINIERY
PAUL S. LIETZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago 26, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter, August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at Effingham, Illinois. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JULY 1950

VOLUME 32

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 21

NUMBER 3

Camilo Henríquez: Padre of the Press

Camilo Henríquez would not compromise. He used every means at his command to fire his countrymen with the ardent desire for independence from Spain. Chile had not yet decided upon full separation from the motherland, had not yet severed all its ties; there were many who vacillated. But Camilo Henríquez was not one of them. He had but one supreme ideal, and that was the emancipation of Chile from Spanish power.¹ Wielding with energy his pen as Chile's first newspaper editor, exercising his influence as a friar of the religious Order of Buena Muerte, demanding respect as a member of the revolutionary government, Camilo Henríquez flung his frail body into the fight for freedom and never relinquished his intellectual sword. He fought for Chile's future and for Chile's betterment in everything that came under his observation. He was the pivot of Chile's intellectual development during the revolutionary period.

* * * *

Camilo Henríquez was born in Valdivia, Chile, on July 20, 1769,² the son of Don Félix Henríquez and doña Rosa González.³ Camilo had two brothers, one of whom died in infancy; the other, José Manuel, was killed later in the unsuccessful defense of Rancagua in 1814.

¹ *Aurora de Chile, 1812-1813, reimpresión paleográfica á plana y renglón con una introducción por Julio Vicuña Cifuentes*, Santiago de Chile, 1903, introducción, vi.

² Diego Barros Arana, *Historia jeneral de Chile*, Santiago de Chile, 1887, VIII, 283.

³ Miguel Luis Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, Santiago de Chile, 1889, I, 6. Chilean historians always refer to the friar of the Buena Muerte as Camilo Henríquez rather than as Camilo Henríquez González.

His only sister, Doña Melchora, married a native of the city of Buenos Aires, Don Diego Pérez de Arce, a son of a family of distinguished Chilean-Argentine stock.⁴

Because his parents were poor, Camilo began his studies in his native Valdivia, one of the poorest cities in poor Chile.⁵ Unlike his brother who had a natural bent for military affairs, Camilo early showed an inclination for a life of study; he seemed pensive and melancholic.⁶ However, he took full advantage of the opportunities at hand, few though they were, and even at the age of fifteen he was known in Valdivia for his keen judgment and for the high development of his intelligence.⁷

Having completed his early schooling, Camilo Henríquez had to make a choice. Only two professional paths were open to intellectually ambitious Chileans: the Church or the profession of law. Because of Camilo's sober disposition, his parents felt that he should follow the religious one, and they made plans to send him to Lima, to his uncle, Father González, in the convent of San Camilo de Lellis, of the Order of Buena Muerte.⁸ Henríquez arrived in Lima in 1784.

Father González put his nephew under the care and direction of Father Ignacio Pinner, also a native of Valdivia, who quickly made friends with Camilo. Under the Father's guidance, Henríquez studied Latin, philosophy, theology, and canon law. These studies would satisfy for his training for the priesthood. Along with this went his practical training in nursing, medicine, hospital routines and organization, public health; this was to be his life, devoting himself to the sick in institutions or homes. Henríquez made good use of the

⁴ Virgilio Figueroa, *Diccionario histórico, biográfico, y bibliográfico de Chile*, Santiago de Chile, 1929, 439.

⁵ Miguel Luis Amunátegui, *Los Precursores de la Independencia de Chile*, Santiago de Chile, 1870, I, 15.

⁶ Luis Montt, *Ensayo sobre la vida i escritos de Camilo Henríquez*, Santiago de Chile, 1872, 18.

⁷ Claudio Gay, *Historia física y política de Chile*, Paris, 1844, V, 274.

⁸ "Henríquez", *Enciclopedia universal ilustrada*, Barcelona, 1930, XX, 72. The Fathers of the Good Death were founded by Camillus de Lellis (1550-1614) in Italy in 1584, for the purpose of taking care of the plague-stricken people. The congregation was officially designated as a religious order by Gregory XIV in 1591. Within forty years the order had established sixteen houses and hospitals and two hundred and forty members had died of plagues contracted during services to the infected in the cities and ships. Houses of the "Camillinos" in the Americas were begun by Father Andrea Sicli, who travelled to Mexico, Peru and Brazil, and died in Portugal on his return in 1694. Most famous of the priests of the order in Lima was Martín de Andrés Pérez, a former professor at Alcalá, who entered the order in Castile, became a superior of its houses in Spain, then went to Lima, where he died at seventy-two in 1770. See *Life of St. Camillus de Lellis*, London, 1850, translated from the Italian of Sanzio Ciatelli and Pantaleone Dolera.

instruction that he received, and Father Pinner appreciated the boy's intelligence and complimented him on his diligence.

The instruction in the convent of the Order of Buena Muerte was exceptionally good for the time. Besides the study of the new ideas for purposes of being able to refute them, advanced thought had crept into the teaching because of the presence there of Padre Isidoro de Celis, the principal professor, author of a book published in Madrid in 1787 that embraced thoughts which influenced the young Valdivian student. The books used contained ideas such as the following: "ignorance is the greatest of all the plagues," "reason is the principal gift God has given to man," "science frees the soul . . .," "the greatest service man can do for his fellow-man is to enlighten him."⁹ The environment and the ideas left their mark on the young Chilean.

Young Henríquez neither neglected his studies nor ignored the wisdom of Padre Isidoro de Celis. He did more. Instead of meditating strictly on his required studies, Henríquez made use of all his available extra time by conning books not in the regular course of instruction.¹⁰ The Fathers of the Order and the other students were not interested in the broader meaning of these books—probably because theirs was an active, not a monastic, Order—while Henríquez was already intrigued with the idea of natural right.¹¹ Camilo dedicated himself with determination and diligence to the study of natural science, medicine (which was later to stand him in good stead), and political science;¹² here he was acquiring the broad foundation of knowledge and intellectual curiosity that was to make him the prophet and pressman of Chilean revolution.

Here, then, in the convent, Henríquez began his study of the French writers of the eighteenth century. Here he learned the liberal ideas that he believed in and used until his death.¹³ Though prohibited books were relatively scarce in Lima in those days, there were various intellectual *limenos* who possessed some, chiefly concerning social and political science, brought back by them from Europe on their frequent voyages abroad.¹⁴ And it is known that Camilo Henríquez enjoyed the friendship of the best society of

⁹ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, I, 11-12.

¹⁰ Gay, *Historia*, V, 274-75.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, V, 275.

¹² Montt, *Camilo Henríquez*, 23.

¹³ "Henríquez", *Enciclopedia*, XX, 72.

¹⁴ Aurelio Díaz Meza, *Leyendas y Episodios Chilenos*, Santiago de Chile, XI, 184.

Lima.¹⁵ He read the books with eagerness, and it is said that he stuffed his mattress with the prohibited material.¹⁶

Henríquez had become acquainted with Rousseau, Voltaire, Montesquieu, and other French authors,¹⁷ and American writers of the independence period such as Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Paine,¹⁸ with whom it may not be too far amiss to compare Henríquez. Thus in his readings he came to know, besides St. Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, Newton, and others.¹⁹ From this reading he developed his philosophy. Immature though it was and subject to change, he nevertheless held fast to its salient points: independence from Spain and the betterment of Spanish America, especially his native Chile.

The spread of forbidden literature in Lima induced the Inquisition to take action. Offenders were brought before the tribunal, and Camilo Henríquez was among them. Details of his case are not available, but it is known that he was kept prisoner for a long time,²⁰ probably from the middle of 1809 until January of 1810.²¹ Finally, in response to the repeated requests of the padres of the Buena Muerte, the Inquisition sent a Father Bustamante to examine Henríquez.²² The Father decided that Henríquez's orthodoxy could not be put in doubt, and the Holy Office acquitted him. Henríquez himself said that he was set free "without a blot on his honor."²³

¹⁵ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, I, 17.

¹⁶ William Spence Robertson, *Hispanic-American Relations with the United States*, New York, 1923, 10.

¹⁷ Montt, *Camilo Henríquez*, 23; D. Barros Arana, *Historia*, VIII, 286. Most Chilean writers acknowledge the French influence upon their revolutionary ideas. Francisco A. Encina, however, in his *Historia de Chile*, Santiago, 1947, VI, 39-44, denies it. But, accepting the viewpoint, as Professor Haring does in *The Spanish Empire in America*, New York, 1947, 346, that the revolutions in America were the work of a comparatively few enlightened, keen-witted leaders, and knowing the significance of Henríquez in the Chilean movement, his reading of the French works takes on undeniable importance.

¹⁸ *Aurora de Chile*, introduction, vi.

¹⁹ John Tate Lanning, *Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies*, New York, 1940, 87.

²⁰ Montt, *Camilo Henríquez*, 24.

²¹ Díaz Meza, *Leyendas y Episodios*, 184.

²² Montt, *Camilo Henríquez*, 24.

²³ "Henríquez", *Enciclopedia*, XX, 439. A. Stuart M. Chisholm in *The Independence of Chile*, Boston, 1911, 185-186, refers to Henríquez as "unfrocked, excommunicated, disgraced . . ." There seems to be no evidence to substantiate the statement that Henríquez was ever unfrocked. I have discussed the matter with various Chilean historians, including Señor Eugenio Pereira Salas, Señor Ricardo Donoso, and Señor Paúl Silva Castro, all of whom agree that from the existing data it is impossible to say that Henríquez was ever excommunicated. José Toribio Medina in his *Historia del Tribunal del Santo Oficio de la Inquisición de Lima (1569-1820)*, Santiago de Chile, 1887, II, 487-502, has published a "Lista de las personas pro-

After his difficulties with the Inquisition, Henríquez was determined to leave Lima. He was sent to Quito, charged with fulfilling a commission for the Order of Buena Muerte²⁴—the founding another convent of his order. Together with the Bishop of Quito, Monseñor Cuero y Caicedo, he also worked effectively for the freeing of a group of *quiteño* patriots²⁵ who, it seems, had been imprisoned in the uprising of 1809 against the royalist forces.²⁶ Camilo's stay in Quito was important in the development of his later convictions. For among his close friends, besides Bishop Cuero y Caicedo, who was considered very much a patriot by the historian Restrepo,²⁷ Henríquez enjoyed the friendship of don José Javier Ascásubi, one of the caudillos of the revolution, of the Jesuit Hospital, and of others important in advanced thought²⁸ in the mountain city.

His stay in Quito seems to have been a turning point in his life. From the 28th of February, 1790,²⁹ when, "through poverty more than through inclination,"³⁰ he took the vows as a friar in the Order of the Buena Muerte, until his trip to Quito, some twenty years later in 1810, he had been chiefly a man of thought, a man of study. He had been in that period of life in which he was forming his beliefs, tying together little bits of revolutionary philosophy into a unified whole that was able to persuade him—and through him, his countrymen—to take the drastic steps which meant the consummation of independence. But now, it appears, his Quito stay

cesadas por el Tribunal del Santo Oficio de Lima de que se da noticia en esta obra." Henríquez is not included in this list. Throughout Carlos Silva Cotapos's volume on *El clero chileno durante la guerra de la Independencia*, Santiago de Chile, 1911, Henríquez is considered a member of his order. José Toribio Medina's *Historia del Tribunal del Santo Oficio de la Inquisición en Chile*, Santiago de Chile, 1890, II, 542, points out that it seems that Henríquez had been accused of reading and lending prohibited books and of having sustained the conclusions of the Synod of Pistoia. Medina also mentions that some have stated that Henríquez was brought before the Inquisition more than once (the year 1802 being given as one of the other dates), but Medina points out that Henríquez spoke of his experience with the Inquisition as only occurring once. Guillermo Feliú Cruz in "Camilo Henríquez, mentor de la Revolución" in *La Prensa chilena desde 1812 hasta 1840*, Santiago de Chile, 1934, 17, says that Henríquez declared after the incident with the Inquisition that he had read the following prohibited books: "el *Contrato Social* de Rousseau; la *Historia del año dos mil cuatrocientos cuarenta*, por Mercier; y *Los Establecimientos americanos*, del abate Reynal."

²⁴ D. Barros Arana, *Historia*, VIII, 283.

²⁵ Ricardo Larrain Bravo, quoted in Manuel Acuña Peña, *Historia y Geografía*, Santiago de Chile, 1944, III, 160.

²⁶ Luis Galdames, *A History of Chile*, translated by Isaac Joslin Cox, Chapel Hill, 1941, 160.

²⁷ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, I, 22.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 22.

²⁹ V. Figueroa, *Diccionario*, 439.

³⁰ D. Barros Arana, *Historia*, VIII, 283.

convinced him that his thoughts could be put into action; Camilo Henríquez was leaving the peacefulness of his thoughts and stepping onto the larger stage of South American revolution. That he was not merely a spectator while in Quito seems firmly established by the indictment of the royalist historian, the Franciscan Father Melchor Martínez, who accused him of having been an apostle of the doctrine of independence who had diffused revolutionary propaganda in Quito.³¹

At the end of September, Henríquez left Quito to return to Lima to give account of his commission before his Order.³² Still firm in his conviction that he would not stay permanently in Lima, he requested his Order to send him to Alto Peru, where existed a convent of the Buena Muerte. His request was granted, and Camilo went to Piura, from which he was to continue to his new residence. There, however, he became seriously ill, as a result, it has been said, of a condition contracted during his imprisonment by the Inquisition.³³

The year 1810 neared an end, and Henríquez had recovered from his serious illness. He prepared to move on. But at this time one of those little events took place that so often change the course of personal history. A ship, coming from Valparaiso, arrived at the Peruvian port, bringing news that on September 18, 1810, the *cabildo abierto* in Santiago had forced the captain-general to resign and that a provisional junta had taken over.

When Camilo Henríquez learned of these developments in his native land, his patriotic spirit surged. We do not know what permissions to return to Chile were granted by his superior, but he was apparently determined to reach his native land to serve it in every way that he could; he wished to put his information and knowledge to use for the benefit of his countrymen.³⁴ He wanted "to bring to his own country the fruit of his studies and experiences, and, in effect, from his arrival in Santiago, he began to have influence on the revolutionary spirits, scattering his knowledge in the patriotic societies to which he belonged, encouraging them and even exalting them."³⁵

Camilo Henríquez went back to Santiago. After twenty-six years of absence, the friar of the Order of Buena Muerte entered Santiago

³¹ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, I, 22.

³² L. Galdames, *History of Chile*, 160.

³³ Díaz Meza, *Leyendas y Episodios*, XI, 185. Feliú Cruz in "Camilo Henríquez, mentor de la Revolución", 18, says that Henríquez had pulmonary consumption ("La tisis ya no deja un momento de reposo al pobre fraile").

³⁴ D. Barros Arana, *Historia*, VIII, 283.

³⁵ Gay, *Historia*, V, 275.

on the last day of 1810. He found the atmosphere of the city permeated with revolutionary thought. The problem of the form of government to be adopted was foremost in the minds of the leaders with whom he soon began to associate. The patriots were sketching lofty plans for their country, but very few people, prevented by the Inquisition from reading tracts on self-government and unaccustomed to leading their own destinies, could formulate into clear, concise, concrete sentences their noble aspirations and republican dreams.³⁶

This was the ideal situation for the Valdivian father. But he was obscure and unknown. He had yet to achieve a position of note; he had yet to make known his ability to contribute to the patriot cause. Very soon, though, by his deeds, he was to become Chile's man of the hour; only eight days after having arrived in Santiago, he was catapulted to fame.

In the first days of January, 1811, a valiant proclamation appeared in Santiago. It produced an immediate sensation, for it was the first document which spoke of independence.³⁷ The proclamation was signed "Quirino Lemáchez,"³⁸ a pseudonym that was soon discovered to belong to one Camilo Henríquez.

The background for the success of this pamphlet had been well laid. Since the resignation of the captain-general, revolutionary ideas had gained many followers. This was evidenced by the great number of hand-written declarations that had been posted on walls throughout the large cities and that had been circulated from house-to-house. There had been, moreover, frequent incidents between creole and Spaniard. It was becoming obvious that, although the junta had pledged itself to Ferdinand VII, the new national government would resist any return to Spanish domination.³⁹

Henríquez began his proclamation by mentioning what had been his own experience. "I come", he said, "from regions near the equator with the single desire of serving you [people of Chile] ... and sustaining the ideas of good men ..."⁴⁰ He remarked how

³⁶ D. Barros Arana, *Historia*, VIII, 283.

³⁷ Mariano Picón Salas, "La Independencia y los ideólogos del progreso (fines del siglo XVIII a 1830)", *Revista Clío*, Año III, no. 5, Santiago, August, 1935, 9.

³⁸ "Henríquez, *Enciclopedia*, XX, 72. The proclamation is quoted in full in the documents section of Fray Melchor Martínez's *Memoria histórica sobre la revolución de Chile desde el cautiverio de Fernando VII, hasta 1814*, Valparaíso, 1848, 314-317. It can also be found in full in the *Colección de Historiadores i de documentos relativos a la Independencia de Chile*, Santiago de Chile, 1911, XIX, 223-231.

³⁹ Ricardo Levene, *Historia de América*, Buenos Aires, 1940, V, 355.

⁴⁰ Encina, *Historia de Chile*, VI, 210.

great was the satisfaction "for a soul born in the hatred of tyranny to see his native land awaken from profound and shameful sleep—sleep that had seemed to be eternal—and to take a great and unexpected step toward liberty." In grandiloquent terms, he spoke of the desirability of this action, comparing it to the actions of Greece, Venice, Holland. He drew a strong comparison between the miserable, colonial state of the English colonies to the north and the Spanish colonies in South America. He told how the English colonies had broken away from their mother country. "Those colonies, or better said, this great and admirable nation, exists for the example and consolation of all people. It is not necessary to be slaves; therefore, a great nation lives free."⁴¹

Henríquez then issued his call that Chile should follow the example of the North American colonies: "To the participation of this fate, we are called, oh people of Chile!" He told them how the Spanish regime had mistreated them, perpetrated crimes on them, left them with nothing. He stressed the point that the government in Spain, thousands of miles from Chilean soil, was unable to govern her correctly.⁴² They were not slaves: "No one can order you against your will." He wanted to know if anyone had received warrants of heaven to accredit them in ordering the people. "Nature made us equal, and only by the strength of a free, spontaneous, and voluntarily celebrated pact can another man exercise over us a just, legitimate, and reasonable authority." But in regard to Spain, neither they—nor their fathers—had made such a pact.⁴³ So protested Camilo Henríquez.

The only remedy for all this, the only way to an absolute solution of the problem was a complete and final declaration of independence. "It is then, I write, oh people! in the books of the eternal destinies, that you be free and happy through the influence of a vigorous constitution and a code of wise laws, that you have a time of splendor and of grandeur, that you occupy an illustrious place in the history of the world."⁴⁴ Finally, Henríquez pleaded for the necessity of selecting men of education, understanding, and patriotism as representatives to the next Congress.⁴⁵

The proclamation found receptive ears not only in Chile but also in Buenos Aires. Mariano Moreno published it in the *Gaceta de*

⁴¹ D. Barros Arana, *Historia*, VIII, 284.

⁴² *Ibid.*, VIII, 285.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, VIII, 285.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, VIII, 285.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, VIII, 285.

Buenos Aires on March 5. It was printed also in other American periodicals; and it was reproduced by José María Blanco White in *El Español* in London.⁴⁶ It was accepted in Europe as the "truest expression and result of the aspirations of the revolutionaries of Spanish America."⁴⁷

During the months of January, February, and March, Camilo, his patriotism proved and his reputation made, marched side-by-side with the leaders of the government in their attempts to solve their many problems. Henríquez, at this time, earned a reputation for himself by means of his sermons, in which he preached his revolutionary ideas.⁴⁸

Soon, however, he had the opportunity of aiding the patriot cause in a new way. On April 1, 1811, Coronel Tomás Figueroa led a rebellion in Santiago against the Junta. It was quickly put down, but before it was, Camilo Henríquez led a patrol through the streets of Santiago, assisting in every way he could to end quickly the royalist uprising.⁴⁹ Dressed in the long black cassock of his Order, with a flaming red cross over his heart, Camilo Henríquez must have seemed a veritable visitation from above who had left his study to put his ideas into use in the revolutionary air of Santiago.

His role as a patrol leader was only part of his activities that memorable day. Figueroa was condemned to death. He wanted a confessor. He asked for the Franciscan Father Blas Alonso. But the Junta preferred sending him someone whose loyalty to the patriot cause was beyond doubt. They sent Camilo Henríquez. The friar of the Buena Muerte performed his unhappy task, and, on leaving the cell of the condemned man, he formed a conviction that lasted him the rest of his life: he was a declared enemy of capital punishment.⁵⁰

A happier task was his in preaching on July 4, 1811, the sermon commencing the solemn opening of the first Chilean national congress. In it, he stressed the significance of the principles of the Catholic religion and the importance of the liberal conquests of the European and North American revolutions. Because the ser-

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, VIII, 286.

⁴⁷ L. Galdames, *History of Chile*, 160.

⁴⁸ Díaz Meza, *Leyendas y Episodios*, XI, 188.

⁴⁹ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, I, 22. Benjamín Vicuña Mackenna in *El Coronel Don Tomás de Figueroa*, Santiago de Chile, 1884, 109, in speaking about Camilo Henríquez's part in the Figueroa affair, says that "Armed with a big stick and with the cassock of the Buena Muerte over his shoulders, he did not cease preaching to the surprised mob the duty of dying before submitting."

⁵⁰ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, I, 36.

mon had the official approbation of the government it had been previously subjected to revision. As a result, Henríquez was not able to speak with so much freedom as he had in his Quirino Lemáchez proclamation; but though he did not mention the word "revolution," his ideas were clear to all. As the royalist historian, Father Melchor Martínez, has summed it up, Henríquez's ideas were three: (1) the change in government in Chile was authorized by the Church, (2) the change was sustained also by reason, and (3) between the government and the people there existed a reciprocal obligation, the first to promote the happiness of the second, and the second to submit to the government with full obedience and confidence.⁵¹

After his sermon Camilo Henríquez busied himself with his duties as a member of the National Congress and with his project for the betterment of Chilean education. Here we see Henríquez emerging as a man with broad vision for the future of Chile; he was not merely a revolutionary propagandist, and a good one, but he was also a social thinker who contemplated every phase of Chilean life.

In November of 1811 his plan appeared, and though it had many defects and deficiencies, it was advanced for the time. Even with its deficiencies, according to Amunátegui, the new nation was unable to put the plan into full effect, such was the country's backwardness.⁵² The Henríquez plan included classes in Spanish grammar, a course in mathematics, and others in social science and civic education. The course in social science included instruction in political economy. Among the more interesting features of the plan was the teaching of liberal ideas, the sentiment of dignity, and fundamental principles of civil law.⁵³

Camilo Henríquez had, as we have seen, already made a memorable contribution to the revolutionary movement in Chile. But he was yet to make his most important one. He was yet to be chosen the first editor of Chile's first newspaper,⁵⁴ an ideal post for a man too delicate to fight as a soldier of the line yet too dynamic, too courageous, too full of ideas to be neglected when his countrymen were in mortal peril.

* * * *

The struggle to obtain a printing press for Chile in order to publish a newspaper began in 1789 when the *cabildo* of Santiago

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, I, 41-42.

⁵² *Ibid.*, I, 43-44.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, I, 43-44.

⁵⁴ Amunátegui, *Los Precursores*, I, 15; D. Barros Arana, *Historia*, VIII, 556; *Aurora de Chile*, introduction, iii.

petitioned the king for permission to establish one.⁵⁵ The effort, however, was fruitless, for the colonial government of Chile, which was to pay the expenses of the press as an administrative institution, did not look favorably on the establishment of the press.⁵⁶ In the early days of the revolution, the idea was reborn. The temporary government realized the great need of a printing press as a means of spreading propaganda, and the governing junta displayed great zeal in the attempt to obtain one.⁵⁷ The first efforts were made through the city of Buenos Aires, where the Junta believed that it might be possible to buy a press. The Argentine port city was already known for its commercial development, but it was unable to furnish the desired printing press.⁵⁸

To the aid of the revolutionary government came, however, one Mateo Arnaldo Hoevel, a Swede by birth, but a naturalized citizen of the United States who was residing as a merchant in Santiago, Chile, at the time. Hoevel was an ardent friend of the revolutionary government, and, since he was a trader with valuable contacts in the United States, he was soon able to put his partiality to the material advantage of the Chilean government.⁵⁹ In February, 1811, therefore, when the Junta decreed freedom of commerce for Chile, Mateo Hoevel endeavored to bring from the United States a printing press, typesetters, and accessory equipment.

Along with a battery of artillery, the press arrived at Valparaíso on the American frigate *Galloway* in November, 1811.⁶⁰ As soon as it was brought to Santiago, the Carrera government purchased it and installed it in the ancient building of the University of San Felipe. The government also employed three printers from the United States who had accompanied Hoevel. They were Samuel Burr Johnston, William H. Burdige, and Simon Garrison; under a decree of February 1st, 1812, they were paid an annual salary of one thousand pesos each.⁶¹ These three men printed the first twenty-one numbers of the paper that was soon to make its appearance. They did, however, have the help of José Camilo Gallardo, a young Chilean who had had some experience in the art.⁶²

⁵⁵ Bernard Moses, *The Intellectual Background of the Revolution in South America 1810-1824*, New York, 1926, 96.

⁵⁶ D. Barros Arana, *Historia*, VIII, 556.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, VIII, 556.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, VIII, 556.

⁵⁹ Henry Clay Evans, Jr., *Chile and its Relations with the United States*, Durham, 1927, 17.

⁶⁰ *Aurora de Chile*, introduction, i.

⁶¹ Moses, *Intellectual Background*, 97.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 106.

The government's most important task now was to find the best possible editor for the proposed paper. Their search was short. They wanted an editor "endowed with political principles, with religion and talent, and . . . with natural and civil virtues."⁶³ They wanted Camilo Henríquez.

Henríquez took the position at a salary of 600 pesos per year⁶⁴ and immediately put his sensitive fingers to the task. To assist him he enlisted the support of Manuel de Salas, philanthropist and economist, Juan Egaña, an esteemed juris-consult, and the young patriot, Manuel José Gandarillas, among others.⁶⁵ On February 13, 1812, this little group published the first number of *La Aurora de Chile*, and from then until April, 1813, when the *Aurora* ceased publication and was replaced by *El monitor araucano*, fifty-eight numbers were published, forty-six between February 13 and December 24, 1812, and twelve between January and April, 1813.⁶⁶

The paper immediately was a great success. According to the royalist historian, Father Melchor Martínez, men

ran through the streets with the paper in their hands, stopped any friend they met, read, and re-read its contents, and congratulated themselves on their good fortune, hoping that the ignorance and blindness in which they had lived would disappear and be followed by enlightenment and culture, which would transform Chile into a country of wise men.⁶⁷

By our standards, the *Aurora* would hardly deserve such praise, for it was a small, tabloid-size, four-page paper. It printed only a limited list of topics, usually a long article by the editor (in which Henríquez discussed important questions of statistics, agriculture, commerce, and the civilizing of the Indians, as well as revolutionary doctrines), a few items of news, and a few important quotations from a foreign source. Yet for Chile in that day, it is difficult to exaggerate the paper's importance as a vehicle for propaganda, propaganda for making certain of the success of the revolution.

That the selection of Camilo Henríquez as editor was no mistake was evidenced by his eagerness in undertaking any task to make the paper better, more effective. "In his eagerness to fill the pages of the paper with the flower of the world's literary production, he learned English in order to add translations from that language to

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 97.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 97.

⁶⁵ L. Galdames, *History of Chile*, 174.

⁶⁶ *Aurora de Chile*. Pages 1-192 contain the first 46 numbers of the paper. The numbering begins again with 1 and continues to 48 for the last 12 issues, the 1813 editions.

⁶⁷ Melchor Martínez, *Memoria Histórica*, 140.

his translations from French, which he knew and spoke, and from Italian, which he learned later . . ."⁶⁸ And, though it has been said that Henríquez was poor in ideas as a political writer,⁶⁹ he had an erudition that, though not profound, had "an extensiveness which it is impossible not to admire, even today, if one thinks of the difficulty with which he had to contend in acquiring it."⁷⁰ He was an elegant writer, though perhaps a little pompous.⁷¹ His vocabulary was abundant. His writing, moreover, covered a great area of knowledge, for he wrote with equal facility on many topics: constitutional law, political economy, public instruction, politics, statistics, colonization, commerce, industry—in general, therefore, on any subject that might be of great concern for the government and the public in their struggle to obtain and maintain an independent and stable state. Perhaps more important, though, was his ability to put his thoughts into terms that the average man could understand. There were others "more learned than he—perhaps Juan Egaña—more lyric and ardent like the poet Vera y Pintado, more caustic like Irisarri; yet none could emulate the Friar in the gift of opportunity," in the ability to put into everyday phrases the ideas of the moment.⁷²

Henríquez's first contribution of note to the *Aurora* was an article in the very first issue, entitled "Fundamental Ideas about the Rights of the People."⁷³ It was a powerful propaganda piece about popular sovereignty. Henríquez broke openly with the doctrine of the divine right of kings. He contended that "the supreme authority gets its origin from the free consent of the people, what we can call a social pact of alliance."⁷⁴ The motto of the paper's prospectus, "Viva lo unión, la patria, y el rey," was further denounced in this first issue by Henríquez when he said that it is

one of the rights of the people to reform the constitution of the state. In fact, the constitution ought to be adapted to the actual circumstances and necessities; as the circumstances vary, the constitution should be changed. There is no law, no custom, that ought to remain fixed if from it proceeds a detriment, an inconvenience, a disturbance of the body politic.⁷⁵

Henríquez's radical ideas were not, however, received with unanimous approval. The provisional government endeavored to control

⁶⁸ Agustín Edwards, *Camilo Henríquez*, Santiago de Chile, 1934, 14.

⁶⁹ Montt, *Camilo Henríquez*, 52.

⁷⁰ Moses, *Intellectual Background*, 100.

⁷¹ V. Figueroa, *Diccionario*, 440.

⁷² Picón Salas, "La Independencia y los ideólogos", 15.

⁷³ *Aurora de Chile*, Tomo I, no. 1 (February 13, 1812), 1-8.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 2.

his statements. This only irritated the friar. He refused to print the governmental decree and in reply published an extensive extract from John Milton's celebrated treatise on liberty of expression, the *Areopagitica*.⁷⁶ After this attempt at censorship, Henríquez became more uncompromising. He wanted a complete change, with no allegiance to the king. To his position, the royalists in Chile were naturally desperately opposed. The fact that they published pamphlets in defense of the viceregal regime was conclusive evidence that the verbal barrage of the editor of *La Aurora* was having telling effect.⁷⁷

Henríquez continued his word war by commenting that not only were strong souls necessary for announcing the public interest, but also that "honest and strong spirits are needed for receiving" the truth. He continued by expressing the idea that now is the time for each one of the revolutionary provinces of America to establish its natural rights.⁷⁸ Like Bernardo Monteagudo, he felt that it would be an insult to the American people to admit the necessity of proving that they ought to be independent. Henríquez believed that "we are free because we desire and are able to be free; it is the order of nature, and yet we are treated as rebels."⁷⁹ He concluded his argument by stating that there is no pact that binds, nor is "there any convention that enslaves indefinitely all generations; nor is there any religious ceremony prescribed by the violence of despotism that annuls the rights of nature."⁸⁰

The political influence exercised by the United States in Chile during the revolutionary period centers about Henríquez and his writings in the *Aurora*, for it was Camilo who admired, understood, and adapted the North American developments to the Chilean situation. Amunátegui says that Henríquez admired the U. S. as "a model, as an inspiration, as a hope—the Capitol of Liberty!"⁸¹

Among his translations, which included Raynal's letter to the French National Assembly and a speech in the British Parliament,⁸² Henríquez included many North American works. He printed a Fourth of July address delivered in Washington, a speech of President Madison to the Senate, Washington's Farewell Address, various works by Thomas Jefferson, and excerpts from Thomas Paine's

⁷⁶ *Aurora de Chile*, introduction, iv.

⁷⁷ Moses, *Intellectual Background*, 99.

⁷⁸ *Aurora de Chile*, Tomo I, no. 35 (October 8, 1812), 145.

⁷⁹ Gay, *Historia*, V, 278.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, V, 278.

⁸¹ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, I, 93.

⁸² Moses, *Intellectual Background*, 101-105.

Common Sense.⁸³ By printing these items, it has been pointed out, Henríquez was trying to show that what he desired for Chile was in perfect harmony with the other events of the age.⁸⁴

In an article entitled "A Memorable Example," Camilo Henríquez once more recalled the impression that the thirteen British colonies had had on him. He cited the case of the Boston blockade and its influence on the rest of the colonies.

When England declared Boston blockaded and began to oppress the city with all her power, the minds of the people became inflamed and the outcry of religion re-enforced that of liberty. The churches resounded with energetic exhortations against the oppressor. These discourses produced a great effect. When the people invoked heaven against the oppressor, they did not delay in rushing to arms. The rest of the colony became more closely united with the capital, all resolved to bury themselves under the ruins of their country rather than to sacrifice their lights. The sentiments of the men of all the provinces were aroused in proportion to the increase of Boston's misfortunes.⁸⁵

The Valdivian cleric foresaw a great future for America as a result of the example of the North Americans. The sacred fire of liberty once lit upon this continent," he said, "will traverse and vivify the most remote parts of the earth."⁸⁶

Henríquez was soon to have occasion to associate with the most important United States citizens then in Chile. On the second of March, 1812, the *Aurora* noted the official reception of Joel Roberts Poinsett as United States representative in Chile.⁸⁷ Not long afterward, the *Aurora* printed Henríquez's patriotic hymn, the *Himno patriótico*, which, soon to become popular in Chile, was sung at a meeting of North Americans in Chile, a meeting called by Poinsett.⁸⁸

Henríquez and Poinsett, united by their common admiration for freedom and the United States' approach to attaining it, became fast friends. Their friendship was not injured, either, by an unfortunate incident that took place at Poinsett's meeting where Henríquez's hymn was sung. It seems that during the meeting some of the North Americans present imbibed a bit too much. After a while, they became rowdy and hard to handle. Poinsett, angered,

⁸³ *Aurora de Chile*, Tomo I, no. 17 (June 4, 1812), 69; Tomo I, no. 40 (November 12, 1812), 165-167; and Tomo I, no. 44 (December 10, 1812), 181-183.

⁸⁴ Moses, *Intellectual Background*, 105.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 101-102.

⁸⁶ Robertson, *Hispanic-American Relations*, 80.

⁸⁷ *Aurora de Chile*, Tomo I, Extraordinaria (March 2, 1812), 15.

⁸⁸ William Miller Collier and Guillermo Feliú Cruz, *La primeramisión de los Estados Unidos en Chile*, Santiago de Chile, 1926, 61-63.

finally ordered them out of the meeting. A small riot ensued, with a few casualties resulting on both the Chilean and American sides, chief among whom was Burdige, one of the *Aurora* printers, who was shot and mortally wounded.⁸⁹ Poinsett finally employed his diplomacy and smoothed over the situation.⁹⁰

Despite the difficulties of the moment, the celebration did aid the cause of Chilean liberty. During the affair preparations were made to act on Henríquez's ideas, among which was the establishment in Chile of a governmental system modelled somewhat upon the government of the United States.⁹¹ A commission of Henríquez and six others was named to draw up a constitution for Chile. Later the commission, composed of, among others, José Miguel Carrera, Henríquez, Antonio Pérez, and Manuel de Salas, met at Poinsett's home for advice and direction. Other meetings were also held at Poinsett's home.⁹²

Poinsett's friendship strengthened Henríquez's convictions and soon he printed one of his most stirring editorials. On July 23, 1812, the editor printed one on love of liberty and closed it with the following paragraph:

In the American provinces formerly subject to the Spanish Empire, a brilliant scene is opened at present. The valour, the resolution of the heroes, the enthusiasm of the ancient and modern republicans has been displayed gloriously for the great cause of national liberty. The sword of expiring tyranny has immolated in some places many victims; but from their blood new heroes have arisen. The genius of liberty presents in these regions a terrible and threatening countenance; undaunted courage and confidence fill the hearts of the patriots; terror and remorse oppress the hearts of the tyrants. The cruelties with which the ancient domination takes leave of the New World, its desperation and bloody fury, even in its latest breath, have made it more odious, have revealed completely its character, have placed men under the necessity of either conquering or dying. Moreover, the American revolution is like all revolutions with respect to the movements it inspires in the mind: the public enthusiasm, the new order of things, continues to reveal unknown talents and extraordinary men. The patriotic fire burns with greater facility and makes its presence more readily manifest in inflammable youth. Youth is the age of energy, of vigour, and of magnanimity. It is capable of great passions; it is also capable of great virtues and high purposes. In revolutions, the spirit is exalted, heroes appear, and occupy the place that belongs to them. In revolutions are manifest

⁸⁹ Dorothy Martha Parton, *The Diplomatic Career of Joel Roberts Poinsett*, Washington, D. C., 1934, 29.

⁹⁰ James Fred Rippy, *Joel R. Poinsett, Versatile American*, Durham, 1935, 43.

⁹¹ Robertson, *Hispanic-American Relations*, 81-82.

⁹² J. F. Rippy, *Poinsett*, 45.

those immortal deeds, those examples of generosity, the admiration of future ages.⁹³

Indeed, throughout the *Aurora*,

the articles by Henríquez remain the most striking feature of the publication. They constitute a medley of patriotic exhortations, illustrative narration, and social philosophy, set forth in a style not infrequently assumed by the preachers of a new political gospel. Daring and uncompromising, the writer appears to be conscious of being the first to sound, without faltering note, the trumpet call to stand for liberty and independence.⁹⁴

Though the *Aurora* made a lasting impression on the people of Santiago, it was not a financial success and it was replaced in April, 1813, by a new publication, *El monitor araucano*. This publication, edited at first by Henríquez, was the official organ of the provisional government. It carried on the propaganda so successfully initiated by the Valdivian cleric.⁹⁵ In it, Henríquez defended the Indians and deplored Spain's treatment of them; he announced that Chile and the other former colonies of Spain had taken such audacious steps that now it would be impossible to return to the *status quo ante*; and he advocated with all his fervor freedom of commerce, pointing out that the prosperous nations of the world owe their success and riches to their vast commerce.⁹⁶

The *Monitor araucano* gave Henríquez another chance to fight for freedom of the press. Using a method—that of questions and answers—which had come into frequent use in Chile during the revolutionary period, Camilo published in his new paper a *Catecismo de los patriotas*.⁹⁷ In it he inquired as to what was one of the clearest signs of the freedom of the people and he answered his own question with the words "freedom of the press." Among the good results he felt would flow from such freedom would be the denunciation of public abuses, the propagation of good ideas, the extension of human knowledge. In the *Catecismo* Henríquez contended that the people have the right of changing and reforming their constitution, because no one generation has the right to subject irrevocably all future generations to their laws. In the *Catecismo*, moreover, Henríquez

⁹³ Moses, *Intellectual Background*, 102–104.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 104.

⁹⁵ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, I, 135. The first fifty numbers of *El monitor araucano*, Tomo I, have been reprinted in the *Colección de Historiadores y de documentos relativos a la Independencia de Chile*, Santiago de Chile, 1914, XXVI. Numbers 51–100 of Tomo I and numbers 1–83 of Tomo II can be found in volume XXVII of the above collection, Santiago de Chile, 1930.

⁹⁶ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, I, 136–144.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 152.

struck another blow at the colonial system, condemning it as the worst of all systems.⁹⁸

While the friar of the Buena Muerte was editing the *Monitor araucano*, he had the opportunity of taking over the editorship of the *Semanaria republicano*, a publication that Antonio José de Irisarri, the violent Guatemalan in the service of Chile, had formerly founded and edited. A fight in the government with Luis Carrera forced Irisarri to resign; Henríquez took charge of the publication, calling it the *Continuación del Semanario republicano*.⁹⁹ In it, he wrote under the name of Cayo Horacio. In this paper Irisarri had once reproached Henríquez for his lack of clarity in writing and in it Henríquez himself had spoken of his own poetical bad taste.¹⁰⁰

With the defeat of the patriots at Rancagua, (October, 1814) Henríquez was forced to leave Chilean soil. He first went to Mendoza, in Argentina, but soon moved on to Buenos Aires. The Argentine government sought from him a report on events in Chile and Henríquez complied by submitting a brief *Ensayo acerca de las causas de los sucesos desastrosos de Chile*.¹⁰¹ The *Ensayo* revealed Henríquez's political vacillations. He had seen various types of government tried in Chile, had lost faith in the republican form, had concluded that a government ought to be adopted in which the supreme authority would reside in a person of high position, if possible of royal birth.

When in Buenos Aires, Henríquez studied mathematics and medicine. Here he had the opportunity to augment the studies of his early days in the convent in Lima. Before he returned to Santiago in 1822, he was practicing medicine in Buenos Aires.¹⁰² But along with his medical practice, he was still endeavoring to spread political ideas. He translated and published while in Buenos Aires Bisset's *Bosquejo de la democracia*.¹⁰³ Henríquez had not yet resigned faith in democratic institutions, for the *Bosquejo* was more an attack on, rather than a defense of, democracy.

In November, 1815, Henríquez had been called to the editorship of the *Gaceta de Buenos Aires*, a position for which he received

⁹⁸ Ricardo Donoso, *El Catecismo Político Cristiano*, Santiago de Chile, 1943, 25-26.

⁹⁹ Montt, *Camilo Henríquez*, 80.

¹⁰⁰ Anibal Raposo Morales, "Aspecto intelectual de Chile en los primeros años del siglo XIX, 1800-1820", in *Boletín de la academia chilena de la historia*, III, Santiago de Chile, 1935, 152.

¹⁰¹ Montt, *Camilo Henríquez*, 91-96.

¹⁰² L. Galdames, *History of Chile*, 480.

¹⁰³ "Henríquez", *Enciclopedia*, XX, 72.

1000 pesos annually. Henríquez was required to write monthly a review entitled *Observaciones acerca de algunos asuntos útiles*. However, his editorship was short-lived. He had attacked in his column certain acts of the Argentine government, and, since his position as official editor was to defend governmental policy, he resigned his post. At the end of eight months, Camilo retired from the *Gaceta*.¹⁰⁴

His other Argentine editorial work included time with the *Censor*, with which he worked from February, 1817, until July 11, 1818. For three years he lived in Montevideo, staying out of politics and the polemics that were a part of his very nature. In 1821, he returned to Buenos Aires to collaborate on the *Curioso*, a periodical devoted to medicine and natural science.¹⁰⁵

One of Henríquez's interesting activities in Argentina was his participation in the "Sociedad del buen gusto en el teatro," which was formed in Buenos Aires in 1817.¹⁰⁶ Unlike Santiago, which had no theatre, Buenos Aires gave Camilo a chance to experiment with this medium.¹⁰⁷ He had previously formed his ideas about the use of the theatre; he felt that it should be used to increase the patriotic spirit of a people. To that end, Henríquez had tried his own hand at playwriting, with results that were only moderately successful, if, indeed, one can say that much for them. For his pragmatic purposes obscured any possible literary ability he might have manifested in less troubled times. His two most significant dramas were *La camila o la patriota de Sud-América* and *La Inocencia en el asilo de las virtudes*.¹⁰⁸ The first was printed; the second was never published. Though they are recognized as being no more than mediocre literary works, they are important for what they reveal of the ideas and sentiments of Camilo Henríquez.

In *La camila o la patriota de Sud-América*, he remarks that danger discovers talents and heroism, unfolds patriotism that otherwise would not have been revealed. Love of native land, he contends, leads to victory. He ends poetically by proclaiming that a time will arrive when the people will no longer be uncertain or vacillating, when "by sea and land, the glorious flag of liberty and union will sparkle majestically." In *La camila*, Henríquez also revealed his ideas

¹⁰⁴ Montt, *Camilo Henríquez*, 99.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 113.

¹⁰⁶ A. Edwards, *Camilo Henríquez*, 20.

¹⁰⁷ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, I, 298.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, II, 309-385. Amunátegui has published the full text of both of these plays at the end of the second volume of his two-volume work on Henríquez.

on immigration of foreigners into Chile. In the play, one of the characters speaks out:

If America does not forget Spanish prejudices and does not adopt more liberal principles, never will it become more than a Spain overseas, as miserable and as obscure as European Spain. For remedying the grievous depopulation of America and its backwardness in the arts and agriculture, it is necessary to call foreigners by the attractiveness of impartial, tolerant, and fatherly laws.¹⁰⁹

From these two examples alone, it is evident that Henríquez thought of the theatre as more than a mere medium for amusement; he put it to work. It was to him and to other fathers of the Hispanic-American Revolution a social institution "whose principal object was propagating patriotic rules and forming civic customs."¹¹⁰ The early patriots feared that schools and newspapers might produce results too slowly, whereas the theatre could stir men to action quickly.¹¹¹

Henríquez himself once wrote in the *Aurora*: "I consider the theatre only as a public school, and in this respect it is incontestable that the dramatic Muse is a great instrument in the hands of politicians." He criticized the actions of poets and writers who fell into the hands of despotic governments, but he went on to remark that there were other authors "whose names will be loved by the people, whose works will be liked while there are men who know how to think and to feel" because these writers "recognize the object of dramatic art."¹¹² He contended that now the writers, in their hour of national crisis, ought "to breathe noble sentiments, to inspire hatred of tyranny and unfold all the dignity of republicanism." He ended in a moving burst of passion: "Ah! Then the tears will not be sterile. Their fruit will be hatred of tyranny and the execration of tyrants!"¹¹³

Henríquez's exile was soon to end, for with the victory of the revolutionary forces in Chile and the acquisition of power by Bernardo O'Higgins, Camilo had the right to return. He had the right to and he wanted to, but his miserable financial condition prevented his doing so. As usual, Camilo's only earthly possessions were a few books.

His friends in Chile had not, however, forgotten him. Manuel

¹⁰⁹ Vicente Pérez Rosales, *Recuerdos del pasado, 1814-1860*, Buenos Aires, 1945, 73.

¹¹⁰ Miguel Luis Amunátegui, *Las primeras representaciones dramáticas en Chile*, Santiago de Chile, 1888, 101.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 103.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 101-102.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 102.

de Salas, one of the most influential and patriotic Chilean intellectual figures of the day, with whom Henríquez had been corresponding, collected some five hundred pesos from various persons in Chile and sent the sum to Henríquez to defray some of his expenses of the return journey.¹¹⁴ Likewise, Bernardo O'Higgins wrote to Henríquez on November 3, 1821, telling him that he (O'Higgins) was writing to the Chilean agent in Buenos Aires, Zañartu, to give to the Valdivian the money necessary for the trip home. It was in this letter that O'Higgins wrote that Henríquez's talent and knowledge were necessary both to Chile and to the head of the Chilean government himself.¹¹⁵

Henríquez came back to Chile full of ideas for the betterment of his native land. He had already previously written on January 1, 1822, to Manuel de Sales that Chile lacked a monthly publication like the English reviews. He recommended that the two of them see what they could do about it.¹¹⁶ As a result, soon there appeared in Santiago a new periodical, *El Mercurio de Chile*. To Henríquez, the new publication was to secure the most difficult part of the revolution, the formidable part of peaceful consolidation. *El Mercurio* was conceived as an instrument for "reforming old abuses, removing obstacles, destroying, constructing—in a word, planning a civilization."¹¹⁷

Henríquez wrote a careful and inclusive prospectus for the review. He wrote that in *El Mercurio* would appear news from Europe and from other parts of America, along with selected portions of the important discourses pronounced in the "six great tribunes of the world." The friar of the Buena Muerte felt that social and administrative science deserved a prominent place in his *revista*. He did not neglect discussion of questions of legislation and political economy. Henríquez recognized the lack of statistical information in Chile and dedicated *El Mercurio* to the task of filling some of the gaps in that branch of knowledge. Camilo's interest in books was also manifested in the review, for he suggested that it should contain brief bibliographical articles. "The plan of the *Mercurio de Chile*," Henríquez wrote in his prospectus, "is so broad

¹¹⁴ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, II, 20. A fragment of the appeal to aid Henríquez, written by Manuel de Salas, can be found in *Escritos de Don Manuel de Salas y documentos relativos a él y a su familia*, Santiago de Chile, 1910-1914, II, 209.

¹¹⁵ Miguel Luis Amunátegui, *La alborada poética en Chile*, Santiago de Chile, 1892, 62-63.

¹¹⁶ A. Edwards, *Camilo Henríquez*, 20-21.

¹¹⁷ Montt, *Camilo Henríquez*, 119.

and comprehensive, it demands such a variety of talents, knowledge, work and relations, that it should be rather the enterprise of a literary society than of an individual." But since such a literary society did not exist in Chile then, Camilo Henríquez asked for the cooperation and patience of his readers and began the task himself.¹¹⁸ Yet, despite his eager and energetic activity, the *revista* did not long survive. *El Mercurio* joined *La Aurora* and the other early Chilean journalistic attempts by ceasing publication on April 21, 1823. Still, before it went to its grave, it had led a distinguished life as the first of Chile's reviews.

Soon Henríquez returned for the last time to the Chilean press. He made his last appearance over an important question of policy—whether or not O'Higgins, who had fallen from power, should be put in command of an expedition to Peru. Henríquez, an admirer and friend of O'Higgins, and still mindful of O'Higgins' help toward his return to Chile, was no myrmidon to his emotions. The friar published his opinion of opposition to the untimely scheme in *El Imparcial de Chile*, a periodical also of short life.¹¹⁹

Camilo Henríquez after his return served Chile in various capacities. He became secretary of the Senate which was formed on March 30, 1823, by the plenipotentiaries of Santiago, Concepción, and Coquimbo.¹²⁰ When, following the fall of O'Higgins, Ramón Freire took over the Chilean government, that stormy petrel, being a better fighter than a statesman, formed a *senado conservador* upon which he depended for advice. It was composed of nine members. Henríquez was among them, performing again the duties of secretary.¹²¹

On July 19, 1823, the government ordered the establishment of a *Biblioteca nacional*. By a decree promulgated on the 22nd of the same month, Henríquez was made the first national librarian, at a salary of five hundred pesos a year.¹²²

Thus, Camilo Henríquez had returned to the surroundings he loved most, to the world of books and education and thought. But before the shadows fell completely, he was able to advocate reforms for Chilean mines, hospitals, schools. Previously he had suggested the planting of oranges as an industry of possible importance for Chile, just as he had once proposed the planting of the trees in the

¹¹⁸ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, II, 45–47.

¹¹⁹ Montt, *Camilo Henríquez*, 121–22.

¹²⁰ A. Edwards, *Camilo Henríquez*, 22.

¹²¹ L. Galdames, *History of Chile*, 224; Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, II, 171–72.

¹²² Amunátegui, *La alborada poética*, 95.

barren, filthy Cañada de Santiago. He felt that the trees would give both beauty to the area and fruit "of which the children and the poor may make use."¹²³ Camilo's mind was not one that would quit fighting merely because his days as newspaperman and statesman were over.

From the friar's many activities, we may surmise, as Miguel Luis Amunátegui has written, that

the reform that Camilo Henríquez desired to be realized was not partial but total. It was a reform that embraced all, from the discipline of the hospitals to public education, from the cultivation of the fields and the working of the mines to the civilizing of the Araucanians, from the cleanliness of the streets to the organization of government.¹²⁴

* * * *

Henríquez had fought the battle of Chile on paper, from the pulpit, and in all the activities of his life. He was the most important religious figure in Chile's struggle for freedom. And though he left the daily functions of his Order behind him when he stepped onto Chilean soil at the end of 1810, it was as "Fray Camilo" that he contributed his part to the revolutionary history of Chile.¹²⁵ His part had been a strenuous one, though, and soon he was to find rest.

Time had drained the friar's meager reservoir of physical strength. His thin frame had bent under the heavy and forceful winds of political and religious controversy that marked his return to Chile. Never had his sallow and pallid face, his sloping shoulders, indicated his alert mind and his acute intellect; certainly now in these waning days his physical appearance was to disclose the fact that the years had taken their share from Camilo Henríquez. His poverty and his illness had contributed their part to the weakening of Chile's cassock-covered knight of the written word, and his days were numbered.

¹²³ Miguel Luis Amunátegui, *Los precursores de la independencia en Chile*, Santiago de Chile, 1909, I, 26.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 25.

¹²⁵ Amunátegui, *Camilo Henríquez*, II, 289-90. Amunátegui points out that though the reading of the French philosophers may have put religious doubts into Camilo's mind, when he came to Chile he practiced all the ministries of the priesthood. The Chilean historian gives as proof of his conclusion the fact that Henríquez was confessor for Tomás Figueroa and that he had preached the sermon for the installation of the National Congress of July 4, 1811. Amunátegui also points out that he had talked with a person who had heard a mass said by Henríquez. All these were religious functions and Henríquez must have been in good standing after his return to Chile to have performed them. Chilean historians, too, almost always refer to Henríquez as the "Friar of the Buena Muerte."

He died an untimely death at the age of fifty-six on the 16th of March, 1825. "From that day, his apotheosis began, which will not end as long as his native land exists and any of his brothers live. He is the hero . . . and the image of his patriotism lives . . ." ¹²⁶ Death had brought an end to his relentless fight for the prosperity of his native land, but, in the final alembic, Henríquez had seen accomplished during his lifetime what he most greatly desired. "What he wished was to instruct the people about their rights and about the fate that awaited them; to leave in their hearts the love of liberty and to prepare them thus, little by little, for the coming of independence, which was the principal object of his most profound meditations." ¹²⁷

IRVIN M. LANDE

Santiago de Chile.

¹²⁶ V. Figueroa, *Diccionario*, 440.

¹²⁷ Gay, *Historia*, V, 277.

Henríquez's remains rest in the cemetery at Valdivia. Figueroa says that a monument has been erected to him in the cemetery of Santiago. The present newspaper association in Santiago bears the name "Asociación de Periodistas 'Camilo Henríquez'." In 1941, the Chilean government issued a postage stamp commemorating the life of Camilo Henríquez; it shows Henríquez seated, wearing the cassock with the cross over his heart and with a newspaper in his hand. One of the principal streets in Valdivia bears his name and a statue has been erected to him in the Plaza.

Cadillac, Proprietor of Detroit

Editor's Introduction

A few days before his death on May 9, 1949, Father Jean Delanglez submitted the manuscript for a volume on Cadillac as his contribution to the celebration in 1951 of the 250th anniversary of the foundation of the city of Detroit. The book was to be of ten chapters. The contents of seven of these have already been published in this quarterly. Due to many circumstances it will now be impossible for the Institute of Jesuit History of Loyola University to publish the volume as planned. We feel, however, that the last three chapters of the manuscript should appear with their predecessors in these pages in order to complete the story of Cadillac and to present the final research of our late colleague.

It may be well to summarize briefly the articles as they have appeared in MID-AMERICA for a better understanding of the following pages. "Cadillac's Early Years in America," published in January, 1944, covers what is known of Cadillac's life from 1658 to 1694. His original name was Antoine Laumet. Born March 5, 1658, in the hamlet of Les Laumets, he was baptized on March 10 in nearby Saint-Nicholas-de-la-Grave, near Caumont, Tarn-et-Garonne, France. There are no records of him until about 1683, when he landed in Acadia. Governor Meneval of Acadia later characterized him as: "one Cadillac, the most malicious man in the world, a rattle-headed fellow, driven out of France for I know not what crimes."

Shortly after his arrival in Acadia Laumet shipped with François Guyon, a privateer, for voyages to the New England coast. He married Guyon's niece in Quebec on June 25, 1687. On this occasion he falsely certified himself as: "Antoine de Lamothe, Escuyer, sieur de Cadillac," thus issuing to himself a patent of nobility. His coat of arms was likewise fashioned by himself. Returning with his bride to Port Royal he received a grant of twenty-five miles on the present Sullivan River, Maine, in July, 1688. This lay undeveloped while he formed a cabal in Port Royal with two officials to violate the trade regulations. When these were summarily recalled to France in 1687, he connived with their successors, engaging in forbidden trade. When these were chastened, Cadillac turned his wits toward other means of making money.

Frontenac arrived in 1689 to replace Denonville as governor of New France. He stopped at Port Royal and ordered that it be fortified. Cadillac was appointed to supervise the workmen. But with King William's War on, the government thought of an attack on the New England colonies. A reconnoitering expedition was made ready. Cadillac was asked to sail with it in virtue of his knowledge of the coast. His ship, leaving Port Royal November 8, 1689, was driven to the Azores, and finally put in at Rochefort on December 23. He was in poverty in France for months, begging for a subsidy and for a recompense for his loss in business while on the reconnaissance. He wrote a glowing recommendation of his ability to Louis XIV, asking for a major's post in Acadia. He claimed to know

the country very well from Acadia to Carolina and he claimed proficiency in the English, Spanish, and Indian languages. Seignelay, the minister, or some official, annotated the letter for the king noting that Cadillac was "very wide awake," "clever," "an adventurer," "necessary in case of an attack on New York," and that he should be warned of punishment "if he should lapse into his earlier faults."

He was still in France without money in July, 1690, but in December he was in Quebec. He won the favor of Frontenac, with whom he never quarreled, though he did quarrel, according to his own statement and all evidence, with "the intendant, the governor-general, the bishop, the priests, the curés, the Jesuits, in short, everybody," and, he boasted, "I always succeeded in everything I undertook, in spite of them, in spite of everybody, and this solely because of the strength of my own genius." Frontenac gave him a lieutenancy for the expedition against the Iroquois in July, 1691, which was ratified March 1, 1693, by the king. During 1692 Frontenac and Cadillac had composed memorials, advocating a sea attack on New York, rather than an overland attack. Cadillac's reward was the lieutenancy, and 1,500 livres for his losses. Frontenac thereupon made Cadillac a captain. In April, 1694, the king confirmed this and added, at Cadillac's request, a commission as naval ensign. Frontenac appointed Cadillac commandant of Michilimackinac in the summer of 1694, and the latter left Montreal for that post, September 28, 1694.

The study of "Antoine Laumet, Alias Cadillac, Commandant at Michilimackinac," was made in three articles in the April, July, and October *MID-AMERICA* numbers of 1945. The French military and trade post was the very important fur center for some thirty western tribes. The key tribes were the Huron and Ottawa, who lived in two villages beside the French village and fort. After the Lachine massacre of the French by the English-backed Iroquois in 1689, the Huron and Ottawa, seeing the French helplessness, were entertaining ideas of going over to the English cause. Frontenac sent Louvigny to command at the post presumably to check the defection, but actually to tighten the controls on the traders. There were twenty-five licenced traders whose *congés*, or annual trade permits, limited both the quantity of merchandise and pelts tradable and specified the places where trade was permissible. It is easy to see that a grafting official could make a tidy sum by allowing licenced traders to carry more merchandise and brandy to the posts and bring back more pelts, by allowing settlers or soldiers more than enough supplies for their own use, and by not questioning traders who met the Indians in the woods or in their villages. Louvigny tried to enforce the laws and the Jesuit missionaries inveighed against the unrestricted brandy trade and the Indian orgies that followed. Louvigny resigned rather than circumvent the laws. Cadillac was appointed to Michilimackinac as one who would see eye to eye with Frontenac.

The chief obstacles to Cadillac's plan of enrichment and to the demoralization of the Indians at Michilimackinac were first the Jesuit missionaries, Nouvel, Gravier, Marest, Pinet and Carheil, secondly, the contractors of Montreal, into whose monopoly he was cutting, and thirdly, the Iroquois-English traders. Even so, the post was lucrative. Cadillac's entire capital in 1694 was his pay of 1,000 livres a year, yet three years later he

was able to send part of his profits, 27,000 livres, to France, and this in the face of royal orders restricting the trade, an ordinance stopping officers from trading, and a general slump in the fur business. The war between the Jesuits and the Frontenac-Cadillac combination over the scandalous fleecing of intoxicated Indians was fought in many pages of letters to and from France. Cadillac versus the Jesuits was one phase of the fifty-year conflict between all the clergy of New France and the brandy distributors. Cadillac's trouble with the contractors and their agents got him haled into court. As for the Iroquois, he tried the "brandy diplomacy." He won over the western chiefs briefly with the promises of brandy, but after a skirmish with the Iroquois no amount of liquor could tempt them to an all-out war against their enemies.

The fur business had gone from bad to worse. The French market was glutted; the furs were inferior and could be used only for hats; the hat makers were closing shop. Men in the trade and business sought government regulation. Therefore, Louis XIV issued a law on May 21, 1696, which effected radical changes in the economic life of New France. He abolished all *congés*, forbade all trade in the woods, and ordered the withdrawal of the garrisons from the western posts. He denounced the disorder, crimes, and debauchery stemming from the conduct of trade and feared the imminent ruin of the colony. The penalty for disobeying his orders would be imprisonment in the galleys. The king was convinced that Michilimackinac and Fort St. Joseph had been founded to "satisfy the greed of a few officers rather than to defend the colony."

Governor Frontenac sought to defend himself at the expense of tale-bearing Jesuits, stupid fur contractors, and improvident hat makers. He used all pretexts for delaying the recall of the traders and garrisons but ordered the missionaries in from their fields. In fact, fifteen months after the edict, on August 29, 1697, when Cadillac reached Montreal with only a few companions, Cadillac was apparently utterly unaware of the royal declaration. He had come east for other reasons and by September 11 was meeting in council with Frontenac, resolving to abandon the western posts.

In Quebec, the intendant, Champigny, had exerted his authority as a law-enforcement agency, quite unsympathetic with the whole Frontenac-Cadillac program. He had notified Cadillac to stop his exactions from the traders and to stop contravening the king's orders. Many and continuous complaints against Cadillac eventuated in a summons for a court hearing in Quebec. People who had been wronged had theretofore feared Frontenac's wrath if they lodged complaints, and judges had feared to render justice. Now aware of Champigny's firm stand, the judges fined Cadillac. He appealed his case to the council, which referred the decision to Champigny. Despite the threats of Frontenac, the intendant retried the case and ordered Cadillac to pay the fine of 2,565 livres. Again backed by the governor Cadillac appealed his case to the minister in France, but ultimately settled with his suers by paying his debts. Thus, after more than a year's trouble in lawsuits, Cadillac sailed for France in the latter part of October, 1698, bearing Frontenac's letters. He arrived at the end of the year, unaware of Frontenac's death.

Undaunted by his rather complete failure as an administrator Cadillac drafted a detailed plan for establishing a new settlement on the strait

connecting Lake Huron and Lake Erie. In early 1699 he submitted this to the king, who on May 27, 1699, referred it to the new governor, Callières, and Champigny, for examination in Quebec. The details are considered in the article: "The Genesis and Building of Detroit," published in the April, 1948, *MID-AMERICA*. With Cadillac's plan went another, the proposal of Sieur Charron, director of the hospital of Montreal. The court was agreed that a fort should be established at Detroit, and it hoped that the details of its ownership, administration, trade, and other problems, might be arranged from the two proposals. Cadillac was told to betake himself to Quebec for the hearing on his plan. He arrived there in the late summer of 1699.

When the assembly met, Callières ignoring Cadillac's utopian ideas for making Frenchmen out of the Indians, felt that the Iroquois would take umbrage at the infringement on their hunting grounds, while the western allies, if brought together at Detroit, would be too close to the English traders. Champigny expressed his vote of no confidence whatever in Cadillac or his projects. The contractors saw in the plan an attempt to destroy their monopoly at Michilimackinac. The post would cut deeply into the fur business of the Montreal traders and moreover would cancel the heavy debt owed to them by the Indians. The summary of the decision signed by the officials on October 20, 1699, was sent to France. Charron's plan to make a stock company, composed of colonials, the proprietor of the post was accepted. Cadillac, seeing the doom of his hopes of establishing himself in a new and lucrative position, hastened back to Paris to present his personal report.

There he got the ear of the new minister of the colonies, Jerome Pontchartrain, who had succeeded his father Louis in 1699. Cadillac received the appointment to establish Fort Pontchartrain and arrived back in Quebec in the late summer of 1700. Although on February 9, 1700, the king had transferred the sole right of trade at Detroit from a large Montreal contractor to the new company, the *Compagnie de la Colonie*, the colonials did not ratify the contract until October 8, 1701. Cadillac spent the last months of 1700 and the first of 1701 bickering, writing letters, considering angles for profit, and organizing his soldiers, traders, and settlers. Before June, 1701, he had moved to Montreal, leaving in Quebec many opponents to the founding expedition, and finding more in Montreal.

The Iroquois chiefs were gathering to sign the peace made in 1700. Lest they hear about the Detroit project and balk, the authorities hastened Cadillac's departure. On June 4, 1701, sieurs de Lamothe and Alphonse Tonti, captains, with one hundred soldiers and settlers, a chaplain, and a temporary Jesuit missionary left Montreal in twenty-five loaded boats. They went by way of the Ottawa River to Lake Huron, then south to the St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair, arriving July 24 at the site of present Detroit. They built Fort Pontchartrain across what is now Shelby Street, between Wayne and Griswold, in a month's time. Tonti was sent as a check on the ambitious Cadillac. The latter's rattle-brain ideas had much to do with making the place an administrative headache during the years 1701-1703 as Delanglez shows in the articles on "Cadillac at Detroit," (*MID-AMERICA*, July and October, 1948).

After constructing a warehouse he wrote Pontchartrain begging that

the region between Detroit and Niagara be made an independent province and that he be appointed governor. The customary pioneer troubles abounded. Provisions ran out; the Canadians were dissatisfied; soldiers were unpaid and some deserted; the workmen were hungry and dwellings unfinished. Though two canoes with victuals arrived, as did the wives of Cadillac and Tonti, no Indians came near. When the Ottawa and Huron chiefs finally came for a pow-wow on October 3, they refused flatly to move from Michilimackinac arguing that the land at Detroit was useless, marshy and without game or fish. Cadillac blamed the Jesuits for this refusal and for trying to wreck his settlement, forgetting that the fathers had to follow, not lead, the Indians to new village sites.

To his chagrin official word finally arrived on July 18, 1702, making Detroit the property of the Company of the Colony rather than of Cadillac. Three days later he left for Quebec, where he signed the Company contract for an annual salary of 2,000 livres and food and board for himself and family. Now, as an officer of the king, he could do no trading. The salary was not much, but it was treble the niggardly pittance which France had previously given him. Considering the starvation salary scale of the time, Delanglez holds the court much to blame for the law evasions and frequent gains by officers through occult compensation, but holds Cadillac alone responsible for his mendacious attacks on any actual or suspected opponent of his schemes, especially the Jesuits.

Cadillac left Quebec at the end of September, 1702, and got back to Detroit November 6. The trade possibilities were practically nil for his post and more complicated outside it. The Huron and Ottawa were then attracted by the cheaper English goods carried by Iroquois middlemen. The Miami at Fort St. Joseph and around Chicago were already negotiating with the Iroquois. All of this Cadillac refused to believe, though no Indians visited Detroit for a month. The Jesuit missionaries at Michilimackinac, whose services Cadillac was bent upon having in the hope that they would be followed by the Ottawa and Huron, were ready to leave, but according to the orders of Callières could do so only if the Indians moved. The Indians had no reason to move and every reason to stay. The scheme of Cadillac seems to have been to fix it so that the profit of the Company of the Colony would be so little that the directors would be glad to give Detroit to him. Then if Michilimackinac could be destroyed as a center, Detroit would come into its own.

The government was more interested in Detroit as a holding and defence point against the British. The trade alliances with the Miami and Iroquois boded evil. If the Ottawa and Huron got similar ideas the west would be lost to France. Michilimackinac had to be retained to keep the Indians there in peace, and also to satisfy Montreal and other traders. Detroit would have to be supported as a defence, and certainly in view of the interests of the new company. Considering the difficult western situation the governor invited the western chiefs to a conference at Montreal. The leading schemer of the west was one Michipichy, a Huron chief, known to the French as Quarante Sols, who had learned enough of business and diplomatic ways to play off French and British, Mohawk and Miami, Cadillac and the Montreal merchants, even Ottawa and Huron, to his best advantage.

I. Indians and Jesuits

When the chiefs of the west reached Montreal, Callières had been dead several months, and Vaudreuil, as acting governor general, received them.¹ The Huron and Miami made their speeches on July 14, 1703, and the Ottawa on September 27. In turn they expressed sorrow over the death of Callières and hopes for the friendship of the new Onotio, whose wishes they had come to ascertain. The Huron Quarante Sols, playing his game, said that the Mohawk had approached him with presents from the English to invite his people to Orange and had also promised the Miami cheaper goods if they would go over to the English.²

Vaudreuil answered the feeler by showing more complete knowledge of the scheme than the Indian had divulged. He handled the matter as, he said, Cadillac should have done earlier, telling Quarante Sols that Onontio was well informed of the English offers and that he was "glad to see the Huron and Miami united, and exhorts them to continue so. The late Callières had invited him Quarante Sols to settle at Detroit; he Vaudreuil does the same, and would permit Sastaretsky head Huron chief at Michilimackinac to go and join him there." Champigny's comment on the English invitation likewise hit Cadillac:

It is the result of the intrigues of Quarante Sols, which seem but too well founded. Sieur de la Mothe ridiculed the Jesuits when they warned him of these intrigues and said that their warning was a device to prevent the Indians from coming to Detroit.³

On the same day the Miami spoke, but made no mention of dealing with the English. Vaudreuil, however, warned them against sending any delegation to the enemy, saying how displeased Onontio would be. He exhorted them to be always attached to sieur de La-mothe. So also did he speak to Le Pesant, chief of the Ottawa-Sinago sub-tribe, traveling with Quarante Sols. The representative of the Ottawa of Michilimackinac, speaking on September 27, said in unmistakable terms that they would never move to Detroit, no matter what Cadillac offered. They wanted to live and die in their

¹ His commission as governor general is dated August 1, 1703; Pierre-George Roy, ed., *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1939*, (RAPQ) Québec, 1939, 10.

² Edmund B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, (NYCD) Albany, 1855, Vol. 9, 752-753, Speeches of the Hurons to M. de Vaudreuil, July 14, 1703.

³ NYCD, 9:753.

village and they wanted a French commandant. Since Cadillac had accused the Jesuits of preventing the Indians from moving to Detroit, Champigny commented:

These words spoken to the governor general, in presence of the intendant, of the clergy, of the officers and of the principal inhabitants of the colony, cannot be called in doubt, whereas the speeches of sieur de Lamothe, who is all by himself at Detroit, are questionable.⁴

Neither Quarante Sols nor Le Pesant stayed very long in Montreal; they had certainly left by the time the Ottawa of Michilimackinac came to speak to Vaudreuil, for on August 20 both were already palavering at Detroit. The *leit-motiv* of their speeches comes to this: Cadillac has promised to sell goods cheaply, yet they do not see any difference between the price they are paying now and the price they paid previously. Callières had told them, said Le Pesant, that

the Jesuits of Michilimackinac would come with us to Detroit. You sent for them last spring; but our people there reported that the Jesuits do not depend on you, and that you are not their commandant. This must be true, for they are not coming, although we know that you sent a canoe to fetch them.⁵

"I believe," answered Cadillac, "that the Jesuits will come this autumn, as M. de Vaudreuil notified me. You must not doubt that I am their commandant as well as the commandant of all the French who are in this country." And in a note, he added: "M. de Lamothe does the opposite of what he says in the hope of soon leaving Detroit, for the Company of the Colony, and MM. de Vaudreuil and Beauharnois [the Intendant] have acted wrongly toward him." On the other hand, Champigny commented thus: "I do not know what his complaints against MM. de Vaudreuil and de Beauharnois might be. He apparently fears that they will unmask him. This merely shows that he is against everybody. Is it not more natural to believe that the whole colony is right than a simple individual?" Cadillac is then reported to have said: "If the Jesuits have waited so long before coming to Detroit, the reason may be that they have not yet been given what they need. This is what they wrote to me when I sent for them this spring." Champigny could not refrain from exclaiming: "This manner of speaking is quite different from that he had used before!"⁶

⁴ Speeches of the Ottawa of Michilimackinac, 27 September, 1703, NYCD, 9:750.

⁵ Pierre Margry, ed., *Découvertes et Établissements des Français dans l'Ouest et dans le Sud de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, 6 vols., Paris, 1876-1888, 5:295.

⁶ Archives des Colonies, Paris, (AC), C 11E, 14: 101.

Cadillac, however, had something else in mind; he wanted to have absolute authority at Detroit. This is clear from the words of Le Pesant. This Indian is supposed to have said that if they are obliged to buy from only one warehouse, they will go to the English. "If," noted Champigny, "they go to the English, M. de Lamothe will be the cause of it."⁷ Then Le Pesant complained that the Indian children were not educated like those of the French. In the note to this passage, Cadillac says: "They [on] were given to understand that there would be a seminary for the instruction of their children." Le Pesant attributes these words to Challières, but there is nothing about the Frenchification scheme in the governor's speeches to the Hurons or Ottawa at Montreal. This outlandish idea, which Champigny called "chimerical," was Cadillac's own invention. Callières is also saddled with another complaint of Le Pesant's—there is no brandy in Detroit. Some liquor had been sent to Lamothe, but naturally not enough to entertain the Indians. "Brandy trade," said Champigny, "is forbidden at Detroit. Sieur de Lamothe himself asked for the prohibition."⁸

When his turn came to speak, Quarante Sols repeated more or less what La Pesant had said. One remark is pertinent, because of Cadillac's comment on it: "When you came here inviting us to settle near you, you did not explain to us that the trade would be in the hands of the Company." Cadillac commented as follows: "M. de Lamothe did not know it either, for if he had, he would not have asked the Court to found the post, because he knows the mind of the Indians."⁹ Champigny must have been waiting for some such statement: "I do not doubt," he notes, "that if sieur de Lamothe had known that the trade of this post was to be given to the Company, he would not have begun it. What he had in mind does not fit in with the good order kept at Detroit."¹⁰

In the rest of his speech Cadillac claimed that he was not the master at Detroit; the reason why the children of the Indians were not educated like those of the French was that war was then being waged in Europe. He exhorted the Indians not to go to the English, and then goes on to say: "It is true that when I came to De-

⁷ AC, C 11E, 14: 99v.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 100.

⁹ Margry, 5: 297 note. Cf. Remarks made by M. de Lamothe concerning the Board of Directors in the *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society Collections and Researches*, (MPHS), Vol. 33, Lansing, Michigan, 1904, 152.

¹⁰ AC, C 11E, 14: 100.

troit, merchandise belonged to the king," but now all the goods belong to the Company.

It is perfectly clear that Cadillac wanted to take the place of the Company. At about this time, he sent to Paris a fanciful balance sheet showing the huge profits made by the shareholders, ranging from 200 to 700 per cent.¹¹ Of course it was much easier to compute the profits made by other people; as we shall see, when the trade at Detroit is given to him, he tells quite another story.

Two days after the meeting with the Indians, Cadillac sent an interminable letter to Pontchartrain, and a shorter one to La Touche. Margry published both letters,¹² which have been translated into English.¹³ The one sent to the minister was summarized and given to Champigny for his remarks which, as we have already pointed out, were omitted by Margry. We shall comment on this letter, which was obviously written with interruptions and abounds in repetitions.

Its opening paragraphs disclose what he had in mind. He had written at length last year,¹⁴ he said, and is writing again this year, "without knowing what decision you have taken concerning the establishment of Detroit." He then speaks of the agreement between himself and the Jesuits; those of Michilimackinac, however, have not yet moved to Detroit, and Marest, instead of coming to Detroit, went to Quebec. The Jesuits, he goes on to say, are absolutely opposed to the Indians coming to Detroit. "You wish that I be their friend and that I do not cause them any trouble. On reflection I found only three ways of getting along with them: the first is, to let them alone; the second, to let them do all they please; and the third, to say nothing about what they are doing."

In the margin of the abstract from this letter, Champigny wrote: "If there is such an incompatibility between the Jesuits and himself, why does he want to force them to come to Detroit? There are many other priests and Recollects; all he needs in his post is one missionary."¹⁵ Cadillac, however, wanted two things: one was to destroy Michilimackinac; the other was to have somebody close at hand with whom he could quarrel.

He then enumerates the tribes that had by then come to Detroit. Only twenty-five Hurons remain at Michilimackinac with Father de

¹¹ MPHS, 33: 152.

¹² Margry, 5: 301-340.

¹³ MPHS, 33: 161-171, and 182-184.

¹⁴ He refers to his letter of September 25, 1702. MPHS, 33: 133-151.

¹⁵ AC, C 11E, 14: 138v.

Carheil, he said, but these too will come to Detroit next autumn: "I am convinced that this obstinate *curé* will die in his parish with no one to bury him." The rest of the Ottawa-Sinago and the Kishkakon would be in Detroit after the harvest; these Indians had sent word that they were coming, but this would have to be done secretly. "Such a procedure shows that they are restrained, and have been intimidated by the fears which have been insinuated in their minds that a dirty trick will be played on them if they come here." The only remark which Champigny makes on all this is that if the Indians are coming, it is a proof that they are not restrained.

He is sending, he says, a copy of the letter which he received from the Jesuits, a copy of the minutes of the councils held at Detroit, and his own remarks in the margin.

Cadillac then asks for a fund of 6,000 livres which he will administer "for things I shall judge necessary," and promises to give an account of the administration of this fund to Callières and Beauharnois.¹⁶ He believes that the Company has gained rather than lost, thanks to the manner in which he has attended to their interests. If it should have any complaint, he offers to make good the loss, and remarks that "if the trade of this country had not been given exclusively to the Company, Detroit would now be fortified." He has found a copper mine near Lake Huron, not far from Detroit, and he wants to send twelve men to search for other mines.

"The last time you sent me here from France, you promised me, my Lord, that you would let me return as soon as Detroit was established. It is now on a sound footing." Champigny noted: "He complains that *on* [the Company] does not let him establish Detroit, and he is asking to go to France, now that Detroit is established. This is self-contradictory."¹⁷

Cadillac does not know whether Pontchartrain has granted jurisdiction over Detroit and over all the other posts of the Northwest, "which I had in the time of M. de Frontenac, and which M. de Callières had granted me by the agreement of September 25, 1702." This called forth the emphatic remark of Champigny that neither Frontenac nor Callières had ever given him such jurisdiction, and he thinks that Cadillac should have no jurisdiction over any other

¹⁶ The mention of Callières in this letter shows that the letter was written at intervals, for by this date Cadillac knew that the governor was dead.—Champigny said that the disposal of the fund should be left to the clerk, otherwise Cadillac would either give no account or give any account he pleased, AC, C 11E, 14: 138v.

¹⁷ AC, C 11E, 14: 140.

post than Detroit, "on the supposition that my Lord wishes to keep him there."¹⁸

Cadillac then speaks of organizing a company of Hurons; he wanted to put them in uniform with captain, lieutenant, ensign, flag, in short, all the frills. This, he says, will have a better effect on the conversion of the Indians than the work of one hundred missionaries. Since the latter began to preach the Gospel, they have made no progress; all their work consists in baptizing some children who die immediately after receiving the sacrament. "I do not believe," notes Champigny, "that the military profession can contribute much to Christianity."¹⁹

If these memoirs had been presented by people who had the protection of the Jesuits, they would have been found excellent. "But because I have not been inclined to be treated like a slave, as some of my predecessors who have commanded in this country were, all my proposals are made impossible." It was easy for Champigny to set matters straight on this score: "Duluth, La Durantaye, Manthet, Courtemanche, Louvigny, and others are brave men. They commanded in the Ottawa country, they took part in war expeditions, and they never in the least felt inclined to let the Jesuits treat them like slaves. What sieur de Lamothe says here is contrary to fact."²⁰

There is a final reference to the Jesuits in this letter on which we shall comment:

You must be aware that there is not a post in this country—not even in the settlement of sieur Juchereau²¹—where there are Frenchmen and not Jesuits also. Detroit alone is without them, although they have shown themselves eager to take care of the missions. This shows their good will toward me. People in this country are very much concerned about what the Jesuits do, but I am not at all eager to see them come, for I know that the parish here is not as prosperous as elsewhere. Nevertheless, they ought to make their choice and speak their minds, because means would be taken to bring in other missionaries. Can they have so much influence that they not only refuse to come to this mission as the king wishes, but also prevent others from coming?

On the one hand, he complains that there are no Jesuits at Detroit, and on the other, he does not care to see them come. Why should he bother then? As for the Jesuits preventing other missionaries from coming to Detroit, Cadillac was, as usual, imagining

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 139v.—Champigny was mistaken; Cadillac had jurisdiction over the Northwest when he was commandant at Michilimackinac.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 140v.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 141.

²¹ He refers to Father Mermet who had gone with Juchereau on the Ohio.

things. How could they have prevented Recollects, for instance, or Priests of the Foreign Missions, from going to Detroit if they had so wished and the Jesuits themselves had been unwilling to do so? Champigny saw this quite well: "It is true that the Jesuits do all they can to avoid going to Detroit. This should not surprise anybody, considering the dispositions of sieur de Lamothe toward them. If he is not at all anxious to see them, as he himself says, why should he force them to go to Detroit?"²² As we have already said, he simply wanted somebody close at hand with whom to quarrel.

The rest of this letter deals with many things which were not his business at all. He compares himself to Moses, to Caleb, to Pilate, to St. John Chrysostom, and returns again and again to the mistake which had been made in not following his original memoir. Had Pontchartrain ordered the memoir to be carried out to the letter, how different would the situation be today! All the *congés*, he said, are useless, and he insisted that "no other post should be permitted in the Ottawa country, because greed and avarice give rise to endless disorders." Yet, observed Champigny, "this greed makes him ask for the suppression of *congés*, and for the suppression of all the posts in the Ottawa country, so as to remain the sole master. If this should come to pass, the colony would be in a sorry plight."²³

As we said above, Cadillac also sent a second letter to La Touche, a clerk in the ministry of the colonies. Since all correspondence addressed to the minister would pass through the hands of La Touche, it would have been a waste of time to repeat what he had said to Pontchartrain. He consequently speaks only of the Jesuits.

He begins this letter by saying that it seems very probable that "the Reverend Jesuit Fathers have asked the Court to take care of the missions of this post, and the Court has no doubt had reason to grant them their wishes." By now, we know what to think of this statement about the Jesuits asking for the mission at Detroit. Many of his other assertions are equally unreliable. He goes on to say that last year, he showed to Callières the letters sent to him by the Jesuits, and the governor "did not seem satisfied with their conduct." Callières was dead when this letter was sent to La Touche, so there was no fear of contradiction. His attack on the Society of Jesus, he continues, was "animated by his zeal for the king's service." He had put down in writing the difficulties with the Jesuits of Michili-

²² AC, C 11E, 14: 142.

²³ *Ibid.*, 141v.

mackinac and since he came to Detroit; all he asked was that the Jesuits should do the same, but "they would never consent to it and thus avoided any decision thereon." The Jesuits, of course, had discovered by this time how foolish it was to argue with Cadillac; they knew that he would never be at a loss to find arguments in his favor and to twist everything so as to appear in the right when he was hopelessly wrong, or again he would bring in altogether irrelevant questions.

The missionaries claim, says Cadillac, that the will of the king must be conformed to the will of God.

Here is a specimen from a sermon of Father de Carheil [*i.e.*, Pinet] given on March 25, 1697. "There is," he said, "no power divine or human which can sanction the brandy trade," whence it follows that this Father rides boldly over all reasons of state, and would not even submit to the decision of the Pope.

Actually, the "reasons of state" were all on the Jesuits' side, insofar as the brandy trade was concerned. It had been forbidden by the king, who should know at least as well as Cadillac, what was for the welfare of the country; and Father Pinet was quite right in saying that the Pope himself could not sanction the sale of brandy as Cadillac understood it.

What the Jesuits do not like, he says, is the nearness of the French settlements. This is a false argument which had been used before by Frontenac and by Cadillac himself; now, however, something else is added to it: the Jesuits could thus instil unreasonable fears into the minds of the Indians and force them to return to Michilimackinac. "I will stake my life that this will never happen, and I do not fear their influence in this respect." The sequel will show who instilled unreasonable fears into the minds of the Indians. As for staking his life, he might as well have forfeited it right now; for we know that in a few years time, the Indians returned to Michilimackinac. If the Jesuits do not want to come to Detroit, he asks, "why do they prevent other missionaries from going there?" We have already answered this foolish question, but Cadillac felt that the repetition of this falsehood would do no harm.

He ends his letter by begging La Touche to enlighten him as to how he can gain the friendship of the Jesuits. "As long as it is question of my private interests, it will be easy; but when there is question of the will of the king and they oppose it, telling me that they know it better than I, I want to know what to do in order to remain friendly with them." The will of the king was actually too

clear to be questioned. Cadillac was allowed to go to Detroit as commandant there, without any idea of gathering the Indians around Detroit; in the plan he was to follow, there was absolutely nothing about a Frenchification scheme, a seminary for the Indians, or the formation of companies of natives. At Michilimackinac, the will of the king was that no brandy should be sold, and it was certainly against the will of the king to substitute an ordinance according to which brandy could be sold there by the barrel.

II. Cadillac and the Company

In his letter to Pontchartrain, Cadillac's use of the term "lease" had an obvious implication, as everyone in Canada realized;²⁴ but in Paris, Pontchartrain was dazzled by Cadillac's rhetoric in spite of the different reports that came from Vaudreuil, from Beauharnois the intendant, from Delino and Riverin, directors of the Company of the Colony.

Vaudreuil, for instance, wrote that "the general opinion is that the post [Detroit] is untenable and burdensome to the [Company of the] Colony, as you will see by the unanimous declaration" of the assembly convoked at Quebec.²⁵ From the speeches of the Indians in Montreal, the governor did not think that they would move to Detroit.²⁶ In their joint letter of the following day, Vaudreuil and Beauharnois are more emphatic still. They do not know who can have written to the minister that the Company was making huge profits at Detroit. (This was Cadillac who had sent his balance sheet to the minister.) The Company has lost more than 12,000 livres last year and will lose much more this year.²⁷ It was a shame, they said, that private interests should prevail over the general interest; but they asked to be dispensed from mentioning any name. Neither Cadillac nor Tonti have attended the general assembly, "for they are at Detroit, from where they write that one-third of the garrison has deserted."²⁸

On the same day that Vaudreuil wrote his letter, Delino wrote

²⁴ "Il va à ses fins quand il dit qu'il ne travaillera . . . qu'après le bail de la Compagnie," *Ibid.*, 139v. There never was any "bail"; the Company had the right to trade at Detroit as long as it pleased.

²⁵ The full report, dated November 9, 1703, is in AC, C 11A, 21: 172 ff, an abstract, dated November 4, 1703, *ibid.*, 170 ff.

²⁶ Vaudreuil to Pontchartrain, November 14, 1703, NYCD, 9: 744.

²⁷ Cf. Delino to Pontchartrain, November 15, 1703, AC, C 11A, 21: 208.

²⁸ Vaudreuil and Beauharnois to Pontchartrain, November 15, 1703, RAPQ, 1939, 13.

to Pontchartrain giving instances of the cost of running the Detroit post. The Company had to pay for the subsistence of Cadillac and Tonti, of their families and their servants, who "number twelve or thirteen persons"; food and personal belongings had to be transported to the place; and there was the useless travel of officers from Detroit to Quebec which had to be paid for. Since the Company cannot accept the idea of giving the post to Cadillac, the only thing to do is to recall the garrison.²⁹

At the beginning of 1704, Riverin had submitted a memorandum in which he outlined the state of affairs at Detroit. Cadillac, he says, had not reckoned with the minister's granting the monopoly of trade to the Company of the Colony. He had flattered himself that Detroit would always be in the king's hands and that it would be for him the occasion of making a fortune. He is now offering to take charge of the post and to reimburse the Company; but the conditions are such that his own private interest is not forgotten. He has nothing else in view than to get hold of Detroit as well as of the trade in the Ottawa country, and so become master of all.³⁰

To the memoir, Riverin added some further reflections. Cadillac, he says, maintained that it was to the king's interest that Detroit be increased and perfected, and claimed that the Company of the Colony was endeavoring to thwart him in this undertaking. He wanted, for instance, to bind the Company to accept whatever pelts he would send to Quebec. He knew that from Detroit he could easily get all kinds of pelts from the Ottawa country, and that either by himself or through others under assumed names he could flood the Quebec market. Hence if Cadillac wants Detroit, he should be allowed to have it only the following conditions: 1) he must reimburse the Company for its advances; 2) the Company should be bound to receive not more than 15,000 livres worth of pelts; 3) an inspector should go to Detroit and make sure that no more canoes than are necessary be sent to the Ottawa country; 4) an inventory should be taken of the arms and merchandise at Detroit. Unless all these conditions are fulfilled, the Company should continue to govern and administer Detroit.³¹

Six weeks after the date of Riverin's memoir, September 3, 1704, Pontchartrain gave Cadillac the proprietorship of Detroit, but the

²⁹ Delino to Pontchartrain, November 15, 1703. AC, C 11A, 21: 207-208v.

³⁰ *Estat present des affaires de la Compagnie de la Colonie de Canada*, AC, C 11A, 22: 100.

³¹ *Reflections on the present State of the Settlement of Detroit in Canada*, MPHS, 33: 185 ff.

letter which notified him was lost when the *Seine* perished at sea.³² The news only arrived in the following year. In the meantime, the Company of the Colony sent more men to Detroit,³³ and Cadillac held more councils.

On June 5, 1704, a clerk by the name of Desnoyers arrived at Detroit to investigate on the spot the affairs of the Company. Cadillac, whose conscience was not clear, for he had juggled the books, had to find some means of sending Desnoyers away. He therefore assembled all the Frenchmen who were at Detroit and had the Indians make speeches. The main speaker for the occasion was none other than Quarante Sols. He began by complaining that Mme Tonti had left the year before, and that Mme de Lamothe and her children, as well as Radisson and his wife, were leaving this year.

We see very well that the governor general is a liar. He has not given us what he promised. Since he lied to us, we will lie to him, too. [And pointing to Desnoyers] What is this man doing here? We neither know nor understand him. All our peltries have been collected for the past two years, and a part has already been taken to Lower Canada. We will not permit anything to leave, unless Frenchmen bring us merchandise.

Cadillac answered that it was quite true that Mme Tonti left last year, but the reason was that she was with child. As for the wives of Cadillac and Radisson, they would stay in Detroit. The governor general is not a liar, he said. At the beginning, Cadillac had merchandise at his disposal, but it had been given by the king, and later "orders came which gave the monopoly to the merchants." The Indians had complained that Desnoyer wanted only beaver pelts; they were wrong, he affirms, for the clerk had not done any trading; and he wants to know who was spreading such rumors around. "But since you are not satisfied with him, [Desnoyers] he himself has resolved to go back" to Montreal. Cadillac and Radisson will also go to Montreal, but Tonti will remain in Detroit.

Since Cadillac was concerned to impress upon Desnoyers the idea that he was not wanted in Detroit, he makes Quarante Sols say that two years ago, the Indians had been told by Callières to go to Detroit where merchandise would be sold cheaply; this is now the third year, and everything has become dearer. Quarante Sols says

³² Pontchartrain to Vaudreuil, September 3, 1704, RAPQ, 1939, 43. On June 14, 1704, Pontchartrain wrote to Cadillac, MPHS, 33: 187-189, stating the terms on which he might receive the proprietorship of Detroit, noting the many complaints against him and denying his petition that he be made Marquis of Detroit.

³³ Judicial Archives of Montreal, April 25, 1704, Greffe Adhémar, 6758 and 6759.

that he is very glad that Desnoyers is going, for he fears lest some young man might forget himself: "We absolutely want him to go." When the Indians came to Detroit, the governor [Callières] had not said that the merchants would be the masters, hence he lied. "This land does not belong to you but to us; we will leave it and go where ever we please, without anyone stopping us."³⁴

As soon as Desnoyers arrived in Quebec in the summer of 1704, the directors of the Company wrote to Pontchartrain, explaining the antecedents of the incident.³⁵ When Cadillac was in Quebec in 1702, they had tried to win him over to their side, because they knew that, in Detroit, he not only could but would make matters very difficult for them, considering what he had written to Pontchartrain. At that time he was telling everybody that the directors actually made a profit of 60,000 livres. To prevent the spreading of such absurd statements, the directors gave Cadillac and Tonti a fixed salary and they were willing to pay for the subsistence of the families of the two officers. This contract was faithfully kept by the Company, but M. de Lamothe "did all he could to make the Company lose money, in order to force it to relinquish its commerce and obtain it for himself."

Since in his previous letters, Cadillac had cast so many aspersions on the honesty of the clerks and other employees of the Company the directors had decided in the spring, they said, to send two new clerks and Roy *dit* Chastelrault as interpreter. But this did not improve the situation, for Cadillac, in league with the former clerks on whom he had cast suspicions, did all he could to put obstacles in the way. He first had the Indians assemble and prompted them to ask that Desnoyers leave the place, else the young men would break his head; then Cadillac asked the advice of the French who said that Desnoyers must go. This was not all. When he heard that Desnoyers had reprimanded the employees of the Company for leaving the fort without his permission, Cadillac called him in and upbraided him; and as the time for departure was at hand, he imprisoned the poor man together with the two other clerks. Tonti did not set them free until three hours after Cadillac's departure.

The reason for this high-handed procedure, said the directors, was to keep Desnoyers from discovering that Cadillac was guilty

³⁴ Conseil tenu au fort Pontchartrain..., June 8 and 9, 1704, AC, F 3, 2: 301-304v.

³⁵ Directors of the Company of Canada to Pontchartrain, August 7, 1704, AC, C 11A, 22: 113-115v.—In November, the procedure was further delayed, for, in the meantime, Cadillac had appealed to the king's council in France, AC, C 11A, 22: 123.

of the malversation which he had imputed to the clerks. "He has taken everything that belongs to the Company in Detroit, and had dispossessed the clerks by keeping them in prison." The directors have already lodged a complaint, they said, with the governor and with the intendant. They are hoping that their lawsuit will be sufficiently advanced when the ships leave for France so that judgment may be passed upon it.

When Cadillac left Detroit with Radisson, three hours ahead of Desnoyers, he went to Montreal and Quebec, where he had full time and opportunity to hear from all sides the accusations against his administration. Knowing that the complaints were going to France, he set himself to the task of getting his refutation of the charges in the same mail. The result of his writing probably in a jail cell, is a most astonishing document in some 18,000 words, which he entitled: Memorandum of M. de Lamothe Cadillac concerning the establishment of Detroit, from Quebec, 19th Nov. 1704.³⁶ Nothing better illustrates the intricate mental maneuvers of which he was capable, his brazenness, and his mendacity. In imagination Cadillac stands before his lord, Pontchartrain, who asks him questions about his stewardship. Cadillac humbly replies. But, the "questions" put by Cadillac in the minister's mouth are frequently amplifications of Cadillac's defense; they are what Cadillac as minister would say to Cadillac of Detroit. For example, Pontchartrain is made to say in his Q. "I see you are right . . ." "I understand what you say . . ." "The King has again considered your scheme, and has ordered me to send you back to Canada . . ." "Go, but do not trouble yourself . . ." "I will take care of you; only act so as to succeed." Perhaps the document should be turned over to psychologists, or dramatists, but it has value as containing many of the accusations which Cadillac had heard against himself and some that he thought might be advanced.

The Memorandum is divided into four chapters. The first chapter, already quoted, justifies Cadillac in all his difficulties with Father Vaillant. In the second chapter Cadillac inveighs against the Company. It begins with Pontchartrain apologizing for establishing the Company:

Q. I could not dispense with granting the trade of Detroit to the Company of the Colony, which promised me to do everything in its power to make that settlement a success.

A. If you had known its power you would have hoped for nothing

³⁶ Cadillac to Pontchartrain, November 14, 1704, MPHS, 33: 198-241.

from it; it is the most beggarly and chimerical company that ever existed. I had as lief see Harlequin emperor of the moon. . . .

And so on to a complete vindication of his actions and a glorification of the value and productivity of Detroit. The last answer is a gem:

A. There is no other Minister so wise, so enlightened and so vigilant as you, who can see through the false zeal of the opponents of the settlement of Detroit, and who can distinguish the injustice of my enemies. You shall see the vileness of it from the manner in which I have behaved, and from their dishonesty.

The third chapter takes up about half of the Memorandum. In the second question Pontchartrain-Cadillac asks: "But whence comes then this cause of hatred and animosity which people have against you . . ." The answer is, for a change, not the Jesuits but "Tonti and two clerks of the Company." Cadillac had caught the two clerks trading, though pledged not to trade, and they had signed a deposition of their red-handed guilt. They were Arnauld and Nolan. Cadillac said that he had notified Callières—who was dead at the time—but his letter was handed to Vandreuil. He had also notified Lotbinières, one of the directors, of what had taken place at Detroit. The whole affair was quashed because, according to Cadillac, an officer, Tonti, was involved in it, and Arnauld was the son-in-law of Lotbinières, who in turn was the uncle of Vandreuil. Cadillac's explanation hinges on the various relationships of the two clerks, and is so involved that one wonders about his sanity.

We are then given an account of the cost of living at Detroit, and of course the directors are blamed for selling at a high price. They do not understand trade at Detroit; they are incurring incredible expenses in order to assist their relatives; and finally, the warehouses of the Company are put to a kind of pillage, and who "knows whether the clerks do not share in the spoils." Lotbinières and Delino are prosecuting Cadillac, and "are laying to my charge atrocious calumnies which they cannot prove." Pontchartrain then "asked" who was the man sent to investigate the matter, and Cadillac answers that he was a certain Vincelot, "whose father is a bastard and his mother illegitimate"; he is also first cousin to M. Pinault, another director of the Company of the Colony.

He also explains after his own fashion the imprisonment of Desnoyers, but he first prepares the ground with a "question." On arriving at Detroit, Desnoyers, Demeule and Chastelrault, the latter two also relatives of Lotbinières and Delino, had accused Radisson of having removed papers which put them at a disadvantage in

their investigation. Cadillac's position was so weak that he began attacking the directors and demanded that they "make reparation for so atrocious a calumny." The reader will note that his promise to give proofs is at once forgotten, and that as soon as the directors accuse Radisson he automatically becomes Cadillac's protégé. The directors, says Cadillac, assert that Radisson influenced the Indians to demand the dismissal of Desnoyers. Why, he inquires, should he himself have asked for this dismissal? Cadillac did not know the man, had never set eyes upon him, although he did provide a meal for him, "which in truth he did not deserve."

He answers Pontchartrain's "question" about Desnoyers' imprisonment by posing another question of his own: Who is this Desnoyers? "A waif and a poor wretch who arrived at Detroit not knowing which way to turn." As for his powers as commandant, they are very wide, "for in case of distinct disobedience, he has the right to run his sword through anyone who offends him." We are quite accustomed to this braggadocio. In Michilimackinac he spoke of "breaking the jaw" of Father de Carheil; in Louisiana he threatened to run his sword through Leblond de la Tour, all this was on paper to be sure.

He then "explains" how Desnoyers was sent to prison. Cadillac questioned Tonti and various soldiers in order to ascertain the facts. Desnoyers, brought before the commandant, was asked whether or not he thought that Cadillac had the power of sending detachments of the Company's employees on the king's service without the leave of Desnoyers. The latter answered that he had made no such claim, but that he did not think that Cadillac had such power. Cadillac thereupon jailed him with the words: "I will teach you, little clerk, to swerve from your duty and to raise sedition by estranging the minds of the men from obedience." This also has a familiar ring. Anyone who opposed this petty tyrant automatically became a traitor. Cadillac also claimed that he urged Desnoyers not to return to Montreal, saying that he himself would take care of the whole matter; but the clerk absolutely refused to listen to reason. "This made me think that Desnoyers had instructions to make the Indians ask for his dismissal."

The next "question" concerns the reason for Desnoyers' second imprisonment. Nobody, answered Cadillac, may leave the post without his permission, but Desnoyers had made all preparations to sail for Montreal without saying anything to anybody, claiming that he was not Cadillac's subordinate. When the latter was ready to depart,

Desnoyers remained closeted with the two other clerks, and having found their canoes, "I sent Desnoyers and the other two clerks to prison." He expatiates on this ruling, "on account of possible malversation and for other reasons." Such, he says, are the acts of violence of which he is accused and because of which the directors opposed his return to Detroit.

Cadillac also had an axe to grind concerning Vaudreuil and Beauharnois. They had permitted the directors to inform against him and had had him arrested by Ramezay who, incidentally, was in league with Cadillac and at once protested against this action in a letter to Paris.³⁷ They had also, complains Cadillac, done all in their power to save the prevaricating clerks at the expense of his reputation and with the intention of wrecking Detroit by removing him from his command. "To sum it all up, I have appealed in this matter on account of the conspiracy between the governor general, the intendant, the Jesuits [?] and the Directors, who believe that by keeping me prisoner under devilish pretexts, they will succeed in destroying Detroit." It is difficult to imagine what the Jesuits had to do with "this matter," and one cannot help wondering whether Cadillac was not throwing dust in the eyes of Pontchartrain. One thing is certain: neither Colbert, nor Seignelay, nor the elder Pont-

³⁷ Ramezay to Pontchartrain, November 14, 1704, MPHS, 33: 194 f.

Editor's Note. From this point the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth facts are ample proof of Cadillac's tendency to kick up enough dust to cloud the case against himself. Father Delanglez was revising his manuscript account of the Memorandum before his death, trying to make clear what Cadillac intended to be confusing. The story seems to be this: Cadillac boasted to the Huron Quarante Sols that he and Radisson had given wampum for the dismissal of Desnoyers. Quarante Sols told the Ottawas. The Ottawas told Desnoyers, who saw a fine chance to get evidence against Cadillac. He sent an Ottawa girl to Michilimackinac to give this testimony to the officer there, Mauthet. Getting wind of this, Cadillac got the girl's brother, Leblanc, to testify at Detroit to the opposite, namely, that he and the rest of the Ottawa "knew nothing, except what Quarante Sols had told them" about Cadillac's action against Desnoyer. Quarante Sols denied knowing or saying anything, since he did not understand the French language and Cadillac did not understand his. This made liars of the Ottawa or of Cadillac's interpreter or Quarante Sols. Cadillac's interpreter happened to be a notorious profligate wench, who denied all complicity in this plot.

What all this means to prove is not clear, but it gives Cadillac an opportunity to flay all concerned. "Let them hang him [Quarante Sols] if they like, what do I care?" "The Governor-General has corrupted his people in order to ruin me." Mauthet and other officers have served jail terms as rebels. Louvigny is a perjurer. Tonti, "whom I denounced two years ago for transacting trade and complicity with the clerks," is classed with other adversaries in these proceedings: "a drunken savage; a dissolute woman; a subdelegate Desnoyers whose kindred is full to overflowing with villainess," the convicted clerks, and the directors.

chartrain would have wasted their time reading such drivel, and their next move would have been to order Cadillac to return to France.

The fourth chapter contains nineteen "facts," with Cadillac's comments on each. To Pontchartrain's warning that he is not to distort the truth in any way, he piously answers: "I have no other patron than truth itself, and so great is my confidence in it that I believe I shall be invincible so long as I fight under its standard." After such an introduction, we can be quite sure that he is about to take all kinds of liberties with the truth. There is no point in analyzing each of these nineteen "facts," some of which are irrelevant and the others testify to Cadillac's power of imagination. A few, however, are worth commenting upon.

Last year, he said, Tonti went down to Montreal and to Quebec and found himself accused of malversation. Instead of punishing him, the directors sent him back to Detroit with the understanding that he would "act in an underhand way against me and against the post." The better to succeed, Tonti was given 600 livres, "under the pretext of having his wife come down to Montreal." Cadillac knew quite well that Tonti did not receive this money, least of all for the reason given, since he had told the Indians of Detroit that Mme Tonti returned because she was with child.

The fifth fact is that Father Marest, Tonti and Manthet were gathered together in Quebec, where the ruin of Detroit was concocted with the Superior of the Jesuits, with Vaudreuil, Beauharnois and the directors of the Company of the Colony. According to Cadillac, they planned to re-establish the *congés* and to re-open the Michilimackinac mission. This whole "fact" is a pure Cadillac fiction, since it is perfectly clear from Marest's subsequent conduct that he had no intention of going to Detroit at all.

The sixth fact concerns the brandy trade. Nobody is allowed to bring any brandy to the Indians under any pretext whatsoever, and these ordinances have always been enforced with all possible severity. Now, enormous quantities of liquor are being taken to the villages "without the Jesuits complaining of it. The latter maintain an unbroken silence, after having made so much fuss about it at the time of Frontenac and Callières; that is, when they were not dominant." The truth is that in the following year, in order to put a stop to the brandy trade and to end the licentiousness of the French, the Jesuits of Michilimackinac set the torch to their house and church, and departed for Quebec, presumably maintaining the "unbroken silence" which Cadillac mentions.

The tenth fact is that all the Hurons of Michilimackinac have now moved to Detroit. He had predicted last year that this would happen, "in spite of the statements to the contrary made by the wonderful Father de Carhetil, their missionary." All the Ottawa, except sixty or eighty, have also come to Detroit. This last migration has surprised every Jesuit in the colony; and one can see what to make of the Jesuits' saying that they would follow the Indians when these move to Detroit. We shall soon see how many Ottawa came to Detroit and how they nearly wrecked the place when they got there.

But the sixty or eighty Ottawa who remained at Michilimackinac went down to Fort Frontenac and kidnapped forty Iroquois. They killed one Iroquois and placed a Huron tomahawk near his body. Although Cadillac confesses that he does not know who planned the coup, he has no doubt that the planner must have wanted the re-establishment of Michilimackinac. The logic of this conclusion is typical of Cadillac's thinking.

The thirteenth "fact" is that Desnoyers was formerly a servant of Denonville, who, with Father de Lamberville, a Jesuit, was "so strongly opposed to the establishment of Detroit." This is pure imagination. Neither Denonville nor Lamberville ever gave a thought to Detroit.

The sixteenth fact is that M. Vincelot accepted evidence which the Ottawa gave under oath. "Where," asks Cadillac, "would you find anyone willing to serve as an officer in Canada, if the evidence of the Indians were received in courts of justice?" He seems to forget that he himself had taken the testimony of Indians at Detroit and had sent it to Pontchartrain; but then the testimony was against the Jesuits, against whom any kind of testimony was acceptable. In his own case, he speaks of the "serious consequences of this kind of evidence and the rude shocks which it gives to the king's authority." He ends his letter by saying: "I beg of you, my Lord, to be good enough to grant me leave to go to France next year, in case you should not grant Detroit to me. But if you wish me to form a settlement there, send me a permit to go to France when I think fit."

Vaudreuil's account of this whole case is quite different. According to him, clearly Quarante Sols was coached by Cadillac, who was ultimately the cause of Desnoyers' dismissal. This matter should be settled between Cadillac and the directors of the Company of the Colony.

I am persuaded, my Lord, that sieur de Lamothe will make every effort to give you an idea of Detroit which will be much to his advantage,

but I doubt very much that the picture he will paint for you can be true; for it is not natural that he alone should see what the whole of Canada was never able to understand.

As for the great number of Indians who, he says, are assembled at Detroit, far from being advantageous to the colony, they have relations with the Seneca, and consequently with the English.

Sieur de Lamothe has asked me to let him go to France, but the intendant has requested me to arrest him, because of a lawsuit which he has with the directors of the Company. Sieur de Beauharnois will let you know why I did not allow Cadillac to leave for France without orders from you.³⁸

Further details are found in the joint letter of Vaudreuil and Beauharnois. As soon as he learned of the Company's petition to abandon Detroit, Cadillac had the Frenchmen, Radisson, and even the chaplain of the fort sign a paper to the effect that he himself and Radisson would come back again to Detroit and, as a pledge of his return, had left two wampum belts with the Indians. Seeing that there was nothing which Vaudreuil and Beauharnois could do, and fearing, moreover, lest the Indians excited by Lamothe would harm the colony, the directors sent Louvigny to Detroit. The latter, who had commanded the Indians while at Michilimackinac, has now, said Vaudreuil and Beauharnois, more or less patched up matters, and has brought to Montreal a part of the pelts left at Detroit. They added that the Indians told Louvigny that they had kept the pelts at Detroit only because of sieur de Lamothe's advice.

III. Proprietor

As soon as Cadillac arrived at Quebec, the directors had him arrested. Though he flatly refused to acknowledge either Vaudreuil or Beauharnois as his judges, this did not prevent Beauharnois from going ahead with the lawsuit. Cadillac, they said, had refused to acknowledge their jurisdiction only because they were convinced that what he had done at Detroit was against the service of the king and the welfare of the colony.³⁹

At the beginning of 1704, Tremblay had received from Cadillac letters and memoirs, which he promptly passed along to Pontchartrain. After these papers had been examined by Champigny, it was

³⁸ Vaudreuil to Pontchartrain, November 16, 1704, RAPQ, 1939, 46.

³⁹ Vaudreuil and Beauharnois to Pontchartrain, November 17, 1704, RAPQ, 1939, 52 f.

thought better not to take action on them. In a letter to Bishop Laval written in 1705, Tremblay remarks that "this year" there will be some change.

I do not know whether it is wise for you to appear so favorable to his [Cadillac's] plans. He has been very severely criticized on account of the trade which they claimed he carried on with the Indians. You yourself have so often written against him in the past, that we are surprised that you now wish to take his part, though not openly but in secret. He is now quarreling with the powers that be, and this will infallibly involve you in a quarrel with them.

Tremblay also warned the bishop against saying anything in favor of either side, because whatever he says will be reported to Vaudreuil and Beauharnois.⁴⁰

In 1705, the Paris government had decided to replace Beauharnois⁴¹ by Antoine-Denis Raudot.⁴² Before the latter left for Canada, the minister communicated Cadillac's petition that his lawsuit with the directors be tried before the royal council, and he asked the new intendant to examine the papers and report to him.⁴³ Two months earlier, Pontchartrain had sent to Raudot a long memoir of Cadillac's (the "questions and answers" Memorandum already mentioned), wherein appear the reasons why there had been so little progress at Detroit. "This memoir deserves attention, for it clearly explains a part of the intrigues of that colony."⁴⁴

We shall now examine two letters of Pontchartrain to Cadillac, one written in 1704, and the other in 1705.⁴⁵ In the notes, we shall give references to the parallel passages in the letters of the king and of Pontchartrain to Vaudreuil, to Beauharnois, and to Raudot.

After acknowledging the receipt of Cadillac's "questions and answers" letter of November 14, 1704, as well as the memoirs which have been sent to him, Pontchartrain continues:

I must confess that I have read with real sorrow the account of all the discussions therein related. I cannot approve of your attitude toward MM. de Vaudreuil and de Beauharnois.⁴⁶ There are other means of making them

⁴⁰ Tremblay to Laval, April 4, 1705. Archives du Séminaire de Québec (Laval University), *Lettres*, Carton N, 122, p. 6 f.

⁴¹ Louis XIV to Vaudreuil, June 17, 1705, RAPQ, 1939, 64.

⁴² Pontchartrain to Vaudreuil, April 15, 1705, *ibid.*, 63.

⁴³ Pontchartrain to Raudot, April 22, 1704, AC, C 11G, 2: 36.

⁴⁴ Pontchartrain to Raudot, March 18, 1705, AC, B 27: 3.

⁴⁵ Pontchartrain to Cadillac June 17, 1705, AC, B 27: 83-85.—Only two short paragraphs from this letter are published in MPHS, 33: 190.

⁴⁶ In his letter to Beauharnois, Pontchartrain says that he disapproves of Cadillac's conduct, "mais au fond, je ne puis me dispenser de vous dire qu'il a paru dans tout ce que vous avez fait contre lui [Cadillac] un peu trop d'animosité de votre part." Pontchartrain to Beauharnois, June 17, 1705, AC, B 27: 76v.

listen to reason besides refusing to acknowledge them as your judges. One is your commandant and the other is there to administer justice. If such refusal became general, an officer would be guaranteed impunity by refusing to obey.⁴⁷

This, said the minister, would be a disorder which is altogether contrary to the will of the king, who has himself charged Raudot to attend to this lawsuit; and if Cadillac is wise, he will come to an understanding with the directors of the Company.⁴⁸

"With regard to Detroit, His Majesty desires that it should be maintained,⁴⁹ and I am writing to M. de Vaudreuil, in behalf of His Majesty, to send you back there."⁵⁰ Pontchartrain is convinced that the governor will give Cadillac all the help he needs.

Enclosed you will find the duplicate of the letter which I wrote you last year, and which was lost when the *Seine* perished. Its contents tell you that His Majesty has agreed that you be allowed to take over Detroit, but at your own risk, and according to your proposals and the conditions which you stipulated, for the situation there is still the same. I am therefore referring you to the conditions mentioned in this enclosed letter.

The letter referred to, which is dated June 14, 1704, has been published in French and in English.⁵¹ After speaking of the Company's alleged losses and of Cadillac's offer to take over Detroit at "his own risk and peril," Pontchartrain goes on to say that he is writing to this effect to the directors, but that Cadillac must pay for the merchandise which is there, and must reimburse the Company for any helpful expenditures which it has made. He is to have complete charge of the post, and he may trade there for his own profit. The only restriction is that he cannot send to Quebec for sale more than fifteen to twenty thousand livres' worth of beaver pelts per year. Cadillac's offer to pay ten thousand livres a year to the king is left in abeyance for the time being.

All trade outside of Detroit is forbidden, but Cadillac is free to induce Indians to come there; and as the Company may "unjustly" complain against him, His Majesty is willing that an inspector, to be paid by the king, be posted there. Vaudreuil has been ordered to give Cadillac as many soldiers as he asks for, and to allow all

⁴⁷ Cf. Louis XIV to Vaudreuil, June 17, 1705, RAPQ, 1939, 68; Pontchartrain to Vaudreuil, June 17, 1705, *ibid.*, 70.

⁴⁸ Cf. Louis XIV to Raudot, June 17, 1705, AC, B 27: 58v.

⁴⁹ The king did not desire anything of the kind; it is Pontchartrain who desired that the post of Detroit should be maintained.

⁵⁰ Cf. Louis XIV to Vaudreuil, June 17, 1705, RAPQ, 1939, 68; Pontchartrain to Vaudreuil, June 17, 1705, *ibid.*, 69.

⁵¹ Margry, 5: 341-345; MPSH, 33: 187-189.

those who are willing to go to Detroit to do so. As for the Indians, "on whom you have counted to establish Detroit," Vaudreuil and Raudot are to provide the necessary missionaries for them. By these means and with such other help as is just and reasonable, "His Majesty hopes that you will be able to realize the plans which you have formed about this post."

By carrying out the king's orders, "you will have no more difficulties with the Jesuits or with anybody else. If these Fathers, who could help you, are not suitable, you may ask for other priests." But no matter for whom he may ask, the minister insists that divine worship be carried on decently, and that debauchery and bad morals be banished from the post. In leaving Cadillac "the absolute master of everything" in Detroit, he hopes that he will be able to attract the Indians there, and that he will give no occasion of jealousy to the Iroquois nor break with them. "I must admit that the only reason why His Majesty hesitated in granting you Detroit was to make sure of avoiding this calamity, from which the colony would be the first to suffer."⁵²

Cadillac may come to France when Detroit is established, but not before the end of the war still being waged in Europe, and in no case may he bring any Indians with him.

I have been advised that Indians from Detroit have sent five canoes to the English. If this is true, it is very likely that this establishment will prove disastrous to the colony; for as soon as the fancy strikes them, they will ally themselves with the English. You cannot take too great precautions to prevent any understanding between the Indians and the enemy. I am recommending you to give your whole attention to this matter and cut at the root any trade between the Indians and the English. This concerns you personally, for the establishment is all yours.⁵³

Hardly had this letter of Pontchartrain's reached Quebec when Cadillac sent a request to Vaudreuil and the two Raudots.⁵⁴ He asked them to give him 200 soldiers, with boats for transporting them to Detroit in the following spring, and inquired whether they would allow Canadian families to settle at the new post.⁵⁵ On the

⁵² Cf. Louis XIV to Vaudreuil and Beauharnois, June 14, 1704, AC, B 25: 121 f.

⁵³ Pontchartrain to Cadillac, June 17, 1705, AC, B 27: 85.

⁵⁴ Jacques Raudot, the father of Antoine-Denis, had arrived in Canada in 1705, at the same time as his son.

⁵⁵ Cadillac to Vaudreuil and the Raudots, September 28, 1705, AC, C 11A, 22: 274-274v.

same day, he signed an agreement with two of the directors for the transfer to himself of their property at Detroit.⁵⁶

In this agreement, he made two points clear: first, that he was not bound to pay for merchandise not saleable to the Indians, and second, that he owed nothing for "houses, buildings, warehouses, and cleared lands," and did not hold himself liable for other "useful and necessary expenditures which the Company may have incurred."⁵⁷

During his first two weeks at Quebec, Cadillac showed that he had plenty of time for correspondence. The four letters which he wrote were summarized in Paris for the minister. This summary was annotated by Champigny, and in the margin were added Pontchartrain's directions for the answer to be sent to Cadillac. It would be out of the question to attempt to analyze the summary of Cadillac's letters, since most of what he says is repeated *ad nauseam* in everyone of them. We shall simply give an outline of their contents and check his version with other documents.

Now that he had charge of Detroit, he would not have been Cadillac had he not found fault with everything and with everybody. One of Champigny's annotations is significant: "Can one trust what he says, when he is speaking against everybody?"⁵⁸ He insists that the governor general, the two intendants, the Jesuits, and many other individuals are all against him, and yet, "Detroit will soon be the Paris of New France."⁵⁹ The post, he adds mournfully, should have been given him in 1703, for there were then fine buildings, much grain, many cattle, and much tilled land. But two months after he had offered to assume full charge at Detroit, "everything was consumed by fire:—the granary, the other buildings and the grain."⁶⁰

In 1704, as soon as he had arrived in Quebec, he says, the directors of the Company brought suit against him and kept him in town. While he was there, Tonti, a tool of the directors, had two

⁵⁶ The agreement is in AC, F 3, 8: 384-386v, published in MPHS, 33: 245-248. Cf. also Proposition du Sr de Lamotte Cadillac, in AC, F 3, 8: 388-388v.

⁵⁷ "Les Sieurs Vaudreuil, Raudot et de Beauharnois ont aussi aplani toutes les difficultez qu'a fait le Sr Delamotte lorsqu'il s'est agi de conclure le traité qui a été passé entre lui et ceux qui régissent les affaires de la Colonie ce qui ne s'est pas fait sans peine et sans grande contesta'on de la part du Sr Delamotte." Vaudreuil, Beauharnois and Raudot to Pontchartrain, October 19, 1705, RAPQ, 1939, 83. Cf. A. D. Raudot to Pontchartrain, October 18, 1705, AC, C 11A, 22: 287v.

⁵⁸ AC, C 11A, 23: 151.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 160.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 146.

great forts built, one to the right and the other to the left of Fort Pontchartrain. Tonti also allowed the Indians to till the land, but the land which had been cleared by Cadillac was allowed to become a wilderness.⁶¹ Consequently, whatever money had been spent to improve Detroit is now nullified, and Cadillac does not feel bound to pay for anything. On this Champigny remarks that Cadillac apparently does not want to go to the post, and is making the Company sustain a clear loss of all its expenses: "If, M. de Vaudreuil had not directly ordered him to go to Detroit, he would have complained that he was not allowed to go to his post."

Cadillac's letters are full of insinuations⁶² and unproved charges,⁶³ by which he tries to poison the mind of the minister.⁶⁴

Everybody is talking about going to Detroit. This disturbs MM. de Saint-Sulpice, who fear that the new colony may depopulate their island [Montreal]. They have been saying all along that land at Detroit is worthless, and now everyone wishes to go there. He will not take with him more than one hundred families.⁶⁵

Champigny noted: "It is for my Lord to decide whether he wishes to establish Detroit at the cost of ruining the whole colony; that is, if what Cadillac says is true."

He also claims that all the canoes have been secretly bought up by his opponents, so that he will not be able to leave next spring. Champigny said: "He wishes to insinuate that everybody is against him, so that if he does not succeed, he can say that it was not his fault." As for the promised two hundred soldiers, he "fears that only the old, the crippled and the scum of the troops will be given him."⁶⁶

Cadillac's letter of October 20, 1705, is so full of complaints about his soldiers, his "dépenses utiles," and the opposition of Vaudreuil, Beauharnois, and Raudot, that he almost forgets to mention the Jesuits. In one passage, however, he finds occasion to narrate what had taken place at Michilimackinac.

Fathers Marest and de Carheil, the missionaries at Michilimackinac, have come down to Quebec after burning their house and church there. They said, and also wrote to Paris, that bad government forced them to take such a resolution.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 146v.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 162.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 156. "Ridicule a dire, devoit prouver s'il vouloit avancer." Pontchartrain's marginal note.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 153v.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 158.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 151.

This event has been widely commented upon, and it is feared that the Court will be irritated by it. He [Cadillac] is persuaded that this post will eventually be re-established more solidly than before, no matter how much it may cost the king, and that these missionaries will be sent back. If, however, Michilimackinac is not re-established, another mission will be opened elsewhere, in order that convoys may be sent to this new place and the mission of Detroit destroyed.

He [Cadillac] tells how the Jesuits have refused to go to Detroit this year [1705] to take care of the mission there. He has never refused to receive them. On the contrary, he has always been most eager to have them. He complains of the obstacles which they placed in his way when Detroit was being established, and of their bad faith in not keeping their word and in trampling under foot the agreement made through M. de Callières, their superior at Quebec, and himself. There are only a few Ottawa at Michilimackinac and no Hurons; the latter are now all in Detroit.⁶⁷

In the margin, Champigny commented on the first two paragraphs as follows: "An answer has been given in the joint letter"; namely, the letter sent by Vaudreuil, Beauharnois and Raudot to the minister. On Cadillac's remark that the king should pay for the re-establishment of Michilimackinac, Pontchartrain notes: "Forbid this [re-establishment] absolutely"; and on the establishment of the mission elsewhere: "Prevent this absolutely." With regard to the third paragraph, Champigny wrote: "He [Cadillac] is too much the enemy of the Jesuits for any one of them to wish to go to Detroit. He would think that they are working against his project, and anything untoward would be imputed to them."

We must now ascertain why the Jesuits set their house and chapel on fire. D'Auteuil piously said that this action had been permitted by God; he added that it would be a good thing if the Jesuits did not go back there, and if all the Indians went to Detroit.⁶⁸ By writing in this vein, he thought he would win favor with Pontchartrain.

After the general amnesty which had been granted to the *coureurs de bois* in 1702, the officials of Quebec, writing to the minister, said that the action of the Jesuits had been forced upon them by three or four *coureurs de bois* who had remained in the Northwest: "M. de Vaudreuil is persuaded that these men would have availed themselves of the amnesty," and that the missionaries need not have resorted to such an extreme measure. Of the two Jesuit mission-

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 152-152v.

⁶⁸ D'Auteuil to Pontchartrain, October 17, 1705, RAPQ, 1923, 21.

aries, one [Marest]⁶⁹ will return to Michilimackinac next spring, for the Indians have asked Vaudreuil for him.⁷⁰

It is difficult to believe that the Jesuits would have taken such a drastic step, if there were only three or four coureurs de bois in the Northwest.

The true explanation is given in a memoir which Father de Lamberville wrote to Pontchartrain in 1706.

It appears from this memoir⁷¹ that their main purpose was to put a stop to the debauchery of the Frenchmen who trade in those parts. The intention of His Majesty is that sieurs de Vaudreuil and the Raudots must put an end to these disorders and take measures by making a few examples which will show these men the horror which His Majesty feels for such conduct.⁷²

Before Cadillac left for Detroit, there were several difficulties which had to be ironed out. The first of these difficulties was the voyage which he wanted to make to France. If Vaudreuil had not feared to disobey the minister's orders to send Cadillac to Detroit, he would have permitted this voyage.⁷³ Cadillac is therefore asking for permission to go to France next year, 1706, when he will find some "expedient" to satisfy the Company of the Colony.⁷⁴ This "expedient" consisted in finding some means or other of not paying 260,000 livres which he still owed the Company.

The second difficulty concerned the two hundred soldiers who were to be sent to Detroit. As soon as the orders came from Paris, Vaudreuil had protested against such a demand. He did not believe, he said, that Pontchartrain wanted to strip the colony of its best troops, and it seemed advisable that sieur de Lamothe should take one hundred soldiers and one hundred civilians.⁷⁵ In a letter which

⁶⁹ Thereafter, Carheil remained in Quebec.

⁷⁰ Vaudreuil, Beauharnois and Raudot to Pontchartrain, October 19, 1708, RAPQ, 1939, 79 f.

⁷¹ Pontchartrain had written to Lamberville on June 2, 1706, asking for information, AC, B 27: 252; and he sent Lamberville's reply to Vaudreuil and the Raudots on June 16, 1706, AM, B 2, 189: 950v.

⁷² Louis XIV to Vaudreuil and the Raudots, June 9, 1706, AC, B 27: 218.

⁷³ Vaudreuil, Beauharnois and Raudot to Pontchartrain, October 19, 1705, RAPQ, 1939, 89.

⁷⁴ Cadillac to Pontchartrain, October 9, 1705, AC, F 3, 8: 388v. The king wrote to Vaudreuil and Raudot, April 9, 1706: "Il n'est pas necessaire qu'il passe en France," RAPQ, 1939, 128.

⁷⁵ Vaudreuil, Beauharnois and Raudot to Pontchartrain, October 19, 1705, RAPQ, 1939, 82. Cf. Vaudreuil to Pontchartrain, October 19, 1705, *ibid.*, 92 f. In this last letter, Vaudreuil, speaking of soldiers having deserted, says: "Ce ne sont pas ordinairement les plus mauvais soldats qui desertent." *Ibid.*, 99.

Cadillac presented to Vaudreuil at the beginning of the following year,⁷⁶ he asked that the choice of soldiers be left to him, so that he might take those who are favorably disposed.⁷⁷ But Vaudreuil answered that he would take the responsibility of sending one hundred and fifty soldiers. Cadillac, however, after a sad experience at Three Rivers, wrote again to Vaudreuil: "It is necessary for me to know whether you will leave me the choice of the soldiers whether they are favorably inclined or otherwise."⁷⁸ But the governor stood firm and wrote to the minister that he could not send more than one hundred and fifty.⁷⁹ At this point the king himself insisted that Cadillac should take two hundred soldiers and "one hundred inhabitants," and gave instructions as to how they should be chosen.⁸⁰ When this letter arrived at Quebec, Cadillac had already left for Detroit with one hundred and fifty soldiers, and he later refused to accept the other fifty, since he would have to pay for their transportation.⁸¹

The third difficulty was the sending of priests to Detroit. In 1705, Cadillac wrote as follows:

He asked M. de Laval, former Bishop of Quebec, as well as the priests of the Séminaire, whether they wanted to take care of the inhabitants of Detroit. They promised to send two priests as soon as they got word from France. This was merely an excuse, for they knew that this establishment [Detroit] would be strongly opposed.⁸²

The warning of Tremblay to Laval in 1705, had been heeded; and in 1707, Tremblay also warned the priests of the Séminaire to say nothing in favor of either party. Both parties, he says, are simply trying to keep as secret as possible the fact that they are making money.

It seems to me that the minister [Pontchartrain] is only too glad to support M. de Lamothe, if for no other reason than to have him spy on the others. I never believed that he [Cadillac] had enough religion to give up the brandy trade on conscientious principles.⁸³

⁷⁶ In order to protect himself, Vaudreuil had asked that Cadillac put all his petitions in writing. Vaudreuil to Pontchartrain, October 10, 1706, RAPQ, 1939, 137.

⁷⁷ Cadillac to Vaudreuil, January 27, 1706, MPHS, 33: 299.

⁷⁸ *Id.* to *id.*, March 18, 1706, *ibid.*, 250 ff.

⁷⁹ Vaudreuil and Raudot to Pontchartrain, April 20, 1706, RAPQ, 1939, 114.

⁸⁰ Louis XIV to Vaudreuil and Raudot, June 9, 1706, *ibid.*, 123.

⁸¹ Louis XIV to *id.*, June 6, 1708, AC, B 29: 326.

⁸² Cadillac to Pontchartrain, October 20, 1705. AC, C 11A, 23: 153v.

⁸³ Tremblay to Messieurs du Séminaire, June 18, 1707, Archives du Séminaire de Québec (Laval University), *Lettres*, Carton M, no. 38, p. 42.

Knowing that the minister would not permit Detroit to be without priests, Cadillac promised that he would have a Recollect come with the convoy in the following spring [1706]. Pontchartrain wrote in the margin: "All right, if nothing better can be arranged."⁸⁴ Cadillac asked for "an additional sum of 1,000 livres for two priests, until such time as the parish can support them." As the time to leave for Detroit drew near, he asked for ornaments for the church to be paid for by the king, and urged the intendant to pay for the Recollect who was already at the fort as well as for a second Recollect who would serve as missionary. The minister approved the sending of another Recollect, but added, "it seems to His Majesty that it is your business to provide for their subsistence."⁸⁵ As it turned out, Cadillac did not have to meet this responsibility. On April 30, Vaudreuil and the two Raudots sent a joint letter to Pontchartrain in which they said in part:

With regard to the missionary whom we gave to sieur de Lamothe, we have the honor of telling you, my Lord, that we suggested that he should take along Father de Carheil, the missionary of the Hurons who are now at Detroit. We thought that this missionary would suit him well, for he had been at Michilimackinac with these Indians and could have kept them at Detroit. Another advantage was that, since the Jesuit Fathers are being paid by the king, the missionary would have cost nothing. He [Cadillac] refused, saying that if he took a Jesuit for the Hurons, he must have another for the Ottawa; and moreover, that Father de Carheil was his enemy. We told him that, since all the Ottawa understood the Huron language, the Father could take care of both tribes, and that the Jesuits could not give two missionaries, for they lack men. But we were finally forced to give him a Recollect, and since the latter could not go without being paid, we gave him 515 livres and all his equipment, which meant an additional expense for the king of more than one hundred *écus*.⁸⁶

The third difficulty concerned the one hundred families which Cadillac proposed to take to Detroit. He must have realized that his former demands had been preposterous, for he now declares that he will be satisfied with fifty.⁸⁷ In another letter to Vaudreuil, he asks that the soldiers who are to go to Detroit be allowed to marry before their departure, "seeing that there are no women in Detroit."⁸⁸ Since Vaudreuil had the power to grant this permission, he made no difficulties. In the following May, Laforest wrote

⁸⁴ Cf. the extract from D'Aigremont's memoir, AC, C 11A, 29: 31.

⁸⁵ Pontchartrain to Cadillac, June 9, 1706, AC, B 27: 268.

⁸⁶ Vaudreuil and the Raudots to Pontchartrain, April 30, 1706, RAPQ, 1939: 116.

⁸⁷ Cadillac to Pontchartrain, October 25, 1705, AC, C 11A, 23: 160v.

⁸⁸ Cadillac to Vaudreuil, April 7, 1706, MPHS, 33: 255.

to Pontchartrain that "several families" were going with the convoy.⁸⁹ If the list published in the *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society* can be trusted, the actual convoy included exactly five families,⁹⁰ and only three soldiers took advantage of the permission granted by Vaudreuil.⁹¹

Cadillac wrote from Montreal that he was ready to proceed to Detroit on May 20, 1706, but a month later he had not yet left the town. Vaudreuil, who was tired of his antics, then ordered him to leave at once with his detachment "composed of eight officers, including Cadillac and Laforest, six sergeants, 144 soldiers and [blank] *habitants*, the men and women whose names Cadillac had reported." Vaudreuil then repeats the instructions which he had received from Paris in the preceding year, and ends by saying that he is persuaded that Cadillac will "show every consideration to the missionaries who are at the post." Cadillac left for Detroit on the same day.⁹² Vaudreuil wrote:

Sieur de Lamothe omitted nothing to delay his departure. He could have left on May 20, and did not leave until June 20. I will not tell you, my Lord, what reasons he may have had for the delay, but it is certain that if he and sieur de Laforest had left a month earlier, they would have spared us the difficulties in which we find ourselves today.⁹³

The difficulties mentioned by Vaudreuil arose out of a brawl between the Ottawa and the Miami in which two Frenchmen, Father De l'Halle and a soldier named La Rivière, were killed.

(To be continued)

JEAN DELANGLEZ

⁸⁹ Laforest to Pontchartrain, May 20, 1706, AC, C 11A, 23: 258v.

⁹⁰ MPHS, 33: 217 f.

⁹¹ The men who went to Detroit in 1706 were: Ignace Vien and Dominique Dubor, who signed the contract on June 12; Pierre Bourdon, Laurent Leveillé, Jacques Moriceau, Jean Brugnion dit Lapierre, Pierre Colet, Louis Moriceau, Claude Martin, Pierre Robert, Paul, Jean and Robert Chevalier, all signing on June 15; on June 16, Maximilien Demers, Louis Renaud dit Duval; on June 21, Denis Baron, René Besnard, and Louis Gastineau.—Among the soldiers, some deserted (Vaudreuil to Pontchartrain, October 10, 1706, RAPQ, 1939, 138); one of the soldiers who had come back from Detroit wanted to become a Recollect; another had a fight in Montreal and was put in jail. The wife of Chanteloup (MPHS, 33: 269) had disappeared and could not be found. Cf. Vaudreuil to Cadillac, July 3, 1706, AC, F 3, 9: 11v-13.

⁹² Vaudreuil to Cadillac, June 20, 1706, AC, F 3, 9: 7-7v.

⁹³ Vaudreuil to Pontchartrain, October 30, 1706, RAPQ, 1939, 137.

The Hon. Charles Augustus Murray among the Pawnees: 1835

The impact of the American savage upon the literature of early nineteenth century England can be clearly seen in the writings of the Romantics. Wordsworth confessed that the only modern books he read were those of travel and soaked himself in Bartram, Hearne and Carver. Coleridge drank deep from the same sources, as also did Lamb, Southey, Hazlitt and Byron. The refraction of the original did not in any way destroy its attractiveness, and as the boom-town atmosphere of the English Industrial Revolution settled down into the comfortable rigidities of a society which ruled the world, the spectacle of uncivilised man once more offered a strange fascination to those whose eyes turned westward.

This fascination was heightened by the writings of James Fenimore Cooper who weaved high romance from the crude life of the frontier. Thackeray put him above Scott, and certainly the dominant personality of Leather Stocking stamped itself upon the imaginations of thousands. Especially in *The Pioneers* (1823), *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826) and *The Prairie* (1827) did he make a mark, and when he followed these up with a visit to Europe, he achieved a reputation that could vie with that of his illustrious contemporary. In his European years, he met at the table of Samuel Rogers, himself a literary man, a certain young Oxford scholar. This young man, the Honorable Charles Augustus Murray, illustrates just how potent Cooper's influence could be in a foreign country, an influence which his biographers have so far neglected to seize upon.

Charles Augustus Murray (1806-1895) was an English gentleman (old style). Adventure was in his bones, and his education, formal as it was, seemed to bring it out. Grandson of the last colonial governor of Virginia, Earl of Murray, he entered Eton in the year in which Waterloo was fought. That the victor of Waterloo should subsequently say (in fun) that the battle had been won on the playing fields of Eton was but a retrospective acknowledgment of the toughness needed to keep ahead at the school. Going up to the University of Oxford, Charles Murray soon gave further evidence of his daring by breaking bounds and riding to his club in London, when he had been confined to college for some minor indiscretion.

He was a sport in the old sense of the word. Before he was twenty-six, he was the amateur tennis champion of the country. He rode, he was hardy, and he did not lose all favour with the academic authorities. On the contrary, he was elected to an All Soul's Fellowship, an academic honor prized highly both then and now, and held his fellowship for over twenty years. As his biographer, the Rt. Hon. Sir Herbert Maxwell, acknowledged in 1898, there was no pinnacle of public life which he might not have scaled, had he concentrated all his gifts to one purpose. But Charles Murray was too accomplished for that. Adventure caught up all else, and the courts, whether academic, legal, or tennis, could not hold him. He met Fenimore Cooper at the table of the family mentor, Samuel Rogers, and made up his mind that he must see America.

An occasion soon presented itself. The Virginia property of the family, (which came down through the third Earl of Murray, the last Governor of Virginia) needed someone to survey it, since the fifth Earl, Murray's father, held it by virtue of deeds then reposing in the capitol at Washington. So, on April 18, 1834, he left Liverpool in the *Waverley*.

His voyage, undertaken before the days of steam navigation, was a fitting prelude to a great adventure. Eight days out, the winds became adverse, and the ship sprang a leak. In spite of the pumps being fully manned, and twenty-eight year old Charles Murray took turn about with the rest, the water gained upon them. The ship was lightened of its cargo, chiefly pig iron and crockery, and the helm was re-set for the Azores. For a week they ran before the winds, eventually meeting a homebound East Indiaman which took off the more frightened passengers. Murray remained, together with the 150 Irish emigrants who crowded the steerage. So badly was the ship knocked about, that when it reached the Azores, repairs lasted a month. Nor were matters any better when they set sail from Fayal once more, for this time, the *Waverley* was becalmed for six weeks. Rations ran out, and when Murray reached Staten Island on July 26, nobody was more surprised to see him than Sir Charles Vaughan, the British Ambassador, as it was believed that the *Waverley* had foundered.

Once in America, he started to sightsee. His first trip up the Hudson was livened by the company of Fenimore Cooper himself, who pointed out the spots made famous by Andre and Arnold. Later, he went to Geneseo, where he met James Wadsworth, then

sixty-six, who was to figure so prominently in his future. His apostrophes upon Wadsworth's self-created estate are themselves interesting in view of Wadsworth's own visit to Europe thirty six years previously to attract European capital to America.

By easy stages, he made his way South to Virginia. The family lands lay round Romney, a village on the northern neck of Virginia. In the mountainous country, his survey lasted for a week. He recorded:

we breakfasted before daylight, and did not cease our investigation till nightfall, when we betook ourselves to the nearest house or cabin for food and rest. We were in every instance kindly and hospitably received, and though our hosts were in many instances very poor, we generally got a good supper of Indian-corn cakes, buck wheat, and wheat bread, coffee, milk, and broiled pork or venison, and slept comfortably . . .

His task over, he was soon back in Washington, where he spent the winter of the year. His comparisons of the Congressional leaders with those of his own country are not as interesting as his comparisons of them to each other. Webster, he thought, would probably be "less successful in directing the impulse and exiting the passions of a popular assembly." When Congress broke up on March 4, 1835, he felt it was time for him to revisit the West. After touring Richmond, Jamestown and Norfolk, he set out in May for Baltimore. He had a melancholy symbol confronting him at Jamestown, where he found the church in ruins, and a more personal cause for reflection on the road to Williamsburg, when he saw his grandfather's residence "little better than a deserted village." The centre of the house had fallen down, and the wings had become cottages.

But he was not the person to lose himself in regrets. The West beckoned, and, as he travelled, he noted the marks left by other hopeful projectors. He did not visit Rapp's settlement at Economy, but he has left us a description of Mrs. Trollope's bazaar at Cincinnati: "a large nondescript edifice of brick, with a stone, or imitation stone, face: it has pillars, a cupola, gothic windows surmounted by Grecian architraves, and scraps of every order (or disorder), from a square brick box to an Ionic volute!" Perhaps his spleen was aroused by an attack of cholera which he sustained here at Cincinnati. He was so ill that he made his will and forwarded it to the British Embassy at Washington. Recovered, he went on to stay with Henry Clay at Lexington. He met Harriet Martineau, certainly not a person with whom he agreed, yet found pleasure in her quick observation and comparison. Much more congenial was

a young German called Vernunft, whom Murray discovered was bound for St. Louis too. Their mutual liking for each other was strengthened by stirrup cups of punch, and Murray's high adventure began.

At St. Louis, Murray wanted to have more talk with General Clarke, whose journeys to the Rocky Mountains had made him a national figure. His adventures with buffalo, bear, and Indian seemed to Murray to yet further authenticate the stories of Fenimore Cooper. His plans were frustrated by the early sailing of a steamer bound for the Upper Missouri, which both he and Vernunft hastened to catch. In the interval, they had gathered together some necessities which they would need to tour the prairie: saddles, blankets and presents chiefly. He noted: "taking with me as little luggage as possible in saddle bags, I set forth on a tour of which it was impossible for me to fix the locality or extent; but having for its object the manners and habits of the extreme West, and of the tribes beyond the American settlements."

After nine days on the river, they reached Liberty, the last western village in the United States. Here they stayed two or three days to make their last preparations. Five ponies and a mule were purchased: one each for Murray, Vernunft and Murray's valet, and the other three for packing the lead, shot, coffee, vermilion, salt, rings, beads, wampum, sugar, knives, bacon, and kitchen utensils. The whole outfit cost him 300 dollars, then equivalent to some £60, and on July 2, the three set out on horseback to Fort Leavenworth, which they reached by nightfall. There they took on a fourth member of the party, a young lad called Hardy.

At Fort Leavenworth, most of the officers were not to be found. They were themselves exploring towards the Rocky Mountains with Colonel Dodge. This expedition was one that Murray had been particularly anxious to join, but since it was impossible he and Vernunft decided to accompany a tribe of Pawnees who were returning to their "nation." Dogherty, the Indian agent, was agreeable. "This gentleman" wrote Murray "entered most obligingly into my scheme; he held a talk with the leaders of the party; told them I was 'a great chief among white men; that I was a son or relative of their grandfather; and that, if they killed me or did me any injury, I should be revenged.'" So, after a further three days preparation, during which time a fifth member was added to the party as an interpreter, Murray and Vernunft set out with the Pawnees on July 7, 1835.

The four chiefs who led the party of a hundred and fifty Pawnees were, to use Murray's own phonetical connotation: Sanitsarish, Patalacharo, and Toolalachashu of the Grand Pawnees, and Leprecolohoolacharo of the Tapage Pawnees. The first of these was Murray's host, and Murray grew very fond of him. Describing him later he wrote: "the old chief himself is one of the finest-looking men of his tribe, but his wives were extremely plain, and very slovenly in appearance." When the party of a hundred and fifty joined the main body, Murray remained with Sanitsarsish, while Vernunft went to stay with Peteresha, one of the chiefs of the Grand Pawnees, and the eldest son of the great chief.

For a fortnight they rode hard in a west by northwest direction, covering from twenty-five to fifty miles a day. On the fourth day they lost two horses, and their baggage was tumbled in a river. On the seventh, they lost the handle of the frying pan, and had to pick their bacon out with their fingers. On the same day they crossed the Great Nimahaw River. Marching in the great heat along the banks of the Blue River, they altered course on July 18, to west by southwest and came to the Northern or Republican fork of the Kansas, following its banks west to find the trail of the roving Pawnee nation. The need was pressing; they had run out of maize already, and were eating roots, while Murray suspected that his dog had long since found its way to the pot.

By July 20, the Indian mode of travel had irked the two attendants, who, rising at four in the morning, eating nothing till one, when breakfast and dinner were eaten at once, and then walking till nightfall, could not be blamed for wishing to return to Fort Leavenworth. Murray "heard sundry complaints, but was conveniently deaf and obstinate." However, from recent marks left in the several encampments, they knew that the Pawnee nation could not be far ahead. After a runner had been sent on ahead, the main body of the nation were soon contacted and asked to linger until Murray and the party could catch up.

The meeting with the main body was on a wide prairie. Handshakes, the pipe of hospitality, and formal introduction by the interpreter, served as a signal for Murray to give them a weak glass of brandy and water all round. In this weak toast (for he made it so that the spirit could "scarcely be tasted") the friendship was sealed, and the chiefs led Murray to the main camp, where no less than five thousand were lying. Men sprawled under their buffalo skin lodges smoking their pipes, while the womenfolk stooped over the

fire busily preparing meat and maize for them. The children, armed with a slight bow and arrow, watched the herds of horses which stretched "as far as the eye could see." As Murray approached the camp with his party, they all crowded to see him. The only members who expressed aversion were the infants who cried and screamed, an aversion soon echoed by the dogs and horses.

Murray was much interested in the lodge. The bases of the walls were composed of the general baggage of the household. Pitched round the exterior of these bales were eight to ten curved willow rods, two or three feet apart, all bound by leather thongs to four large upright poles that formed the front of the lodge. Along these poles ran transverse willow rods, to which the ends of the curved ones were fastened. This provided the skeleton. Upon this skeleton were buffalo hides, stitched together. A similar covering and reed mats were spread over the floor. In the lodge, everyone has his or her assigned place, sleeping upon his or her own robe with saddle and bridle behind his back. Murray, as the scion of a noble family, was amused to see that armorial bearings were recognized even here, for before the tent was usually erected a kind of shield upon three poles. But the greatest symbol of all was in the centre of the tent itself. There, hung the medicine bag, containing arrow heads with which their ancestors had killed a foe, scalps, and other relics.

Murray was also much impressed by the integration of the Pawnee economy around the central figure of the buffalo. Its flesh was their principal, and often their only food. Its skin not only covered the walls and floors of lodges, but covered their bales, their beds, their horses, and their debts to the white men. From it, they made lariats and halters for their horses. Its sinews served to string their bows, as well as to provide twine or thread. The bones served as scrapers and chisels, or as needles; the ribs composing bows; and the hoof, at the end of the shank bone, providing a mallet. As if all this were not enough, the resourceful Pawnees found in the brains of the buffalo the best softener and dresser of the skins. When the prairies were barren, and the droughts caused shortage of water, the buffalo was always a source of fuel, and its bladder always provided a good water carrier. "Where the buffalo is exterminated," Murray wrote, "the Indian of the prairie must perish."

Naturally enough, to hunt the buffalo was the major pre-occupa-

tion of the Pawnees, and in this Murray was soon to participate. Only two days after he and his party had caught up with the nation, the cry "Taraha! Taraha!" was raised. Buffalo had been sighted fifteen miles off, and immediately a thousand braves were mounted in pursuit. Murray's horse was too winded for him to keep up with them, so he went back to watch the skinning process of those which had been killed. Fifteen minutes all told sufficed for the animal to be disposed of; some of the Indians even eating the marrow and the liver raw upon the spot.

On the evening of that same day, the camp was alarmed by the Arikarees. In spite of a great uproar of sound sustained by the Pawnees, the marauders made off with twenty six horses, including two of Murray's. Nor was this the only attack made upon them by neighboring tribes, for a day or two later some 200 Cheyennes attacked them, only to be beaten off. Indeed, Murray learned rapidly that the nobility of the savage was only a myth. "I never met with liars so determined, universal, or audacious," he commented; "the chiefs themselves told me repeatedly the most deliberate and gross untruths to serve a trifling purpose with the gravity of a chief-justice; and I doubt whether Baron Munchausen himself would be more than a match for the great chief of the Pawnees." From these charges, however, Murray completely exonerated his host Sanitsarish: "Nature had made him a gentleman, and he remained so, in spite of the corrupting examples around him."

At the parties he attended, Murray suffered acutely from the roving fingers of his enthusiastic hosts. As the Pawnees and himself sat cross-legged round a bowl of Indian corn or buffalo meat, each plying their own horn spoon in the endeavor to feed themselves, the giver of the feast would finger his blue shirt, examine his knife, try on his hat, explore his pockets, asking questions all the while. Murray suffered for a short time only, namely till the fleas and lice of the Pawnees began to inhabit his own apparel. Then he told them such activities must cease. They did.

If the Pawnees scrutinised Murray, he repaid the compliment by leaving a full account of their marriage customs, their sartorial habits, and philosophy. Marriage he quickly dismissed, since he confessed "I never saw one instance of beauty, either in face or figure—of neatness in dress—cleanliness in appearance, or of any one of those graceful and attractive attributes which generally characterize the softer sex." He found that polygamy among the Pawnees was based on the desire to have a large number of servants,

because service was the main function of the wives. Yet the Peer among the Pawnees was forced to confess:

the women appear contented and even happy; they laugh under their burdens, and chatter half the night. They even seem to be proof against the pains of the primal punishment brought, by sin, upon womankind; for they pursue their ordinary occupations until the latest period of their labour, and immediately after the birth of the child resume them without interruption.

Sanitsarish's son furnished him with an object lesson in Pawnee dandyism. From the crown of his tufted, pigtailed head, to the scarlet cloth leggings which bound his knees, he was a very model of elegance. Their idea of a divinity was that of a single spirit, generally benevolent, according to the supplies he received of buffalo meat. Supporting this supreme spirit, they also believed in others of a secondary cast, in whom they saw a likeness to buffaloes, bears, or deer. Each person considered himself under the protection of one of these tutelary spirits, and, when excited, would imitate the appropriate actions, such as creeping and growling like a bear, or roaring and stamping like a buffalo. The Great Spirit was always accorded the first spoonful of maize or morsel of meat at a feast and the first puff of smoke.

Before the great buffalo hunt began, auguries were taken by the medicine men. Since they found them inauspicious, the 28th was spent in selecting the guards for the management of the hunt. Because a quarrell existed between the Grand and Republican River Pawnees as to who should be entrusted with this task, the whole of the day was lost in wrangling. Nor was this rectified till two days later, when the encampment broke up and began travelling southward. From this time on they followed a southeasterly march in order to be near the sources of the Saline River and other streams falling into the Kansas. In the march, Murray noticed that a small band of Otoes accompanying the nation, led by their chief Iotan, whose nose had been bitten off by an angry brother. "Alas" recorded Murray "he has been corrupted by the poison of the whiskey bottle."

There were many days of what Murray called "improvident inactivity," during which he would attend feasts, and study the habits of his wild hosts. He commented:

the folly of the Indians in wasting so much valuable time was to me almost incomprehensible, when it is considered that their whole winter supply of provisions depends upon the summer hunt. They would be obliged to return to their village in three or four weeks, or they would lose their crop of maize.

Murray himself was becoming as dissatisfied as his companions, the more so since he had lost four of his original stock of horses. One night, while he and Vernunft were taking a walk they were stalked by a brave armed with bow and arrows. Fortunately their own presence of mind made them accost him immediately, and return with him to the camp so as to prevent him from doing any damage. Murray himself was unconsciously becoming savage-like in his suspicions—and even in his eating habits, for he actually began to eat raw meat.

Two miles from his camp on August 3, he noted "one of the most extraordinary objects of curiosity" that he had seen in the western prairies. Rising from the centre of the plain was a precipitous range of a "soft crumbling argillaceous substance" in which lime and shells predominated. He decided to carry home some of these mineral specimens for examination, thinking that they might contain iron. His Indian friends told him that the crumbling cliff receded as much as four or five feet in as many years, leaving behind columns of unweathered rocks, which were regarded as porticoes for the temple of the Great Spirit.

On August 5, it was announced that the Great Spirit was propitiated, so the grand hunt was on. Murray said "this was the most magnificent preparation for hunting I had yet seen." Marching in three parallel lines, in strict order, under the chief of the Grand Pawnees (who had supplanted Sanitsarish), they reminded Murray of a regular army. The chief himself, mounted on a cream colored horse, was seated in a Mexican peak-saddle and wore Spanish gilt spurs. A heavy and highly ornamented Spanish bridle adorned with gilt stars, chains, and buckles, seemed to Murray to have come to the chief with the Spanish spurs, probably stemming from some caballero of the seventeenth century. The chief's immediate entourage, who had been to Fort Leavenworth, wore round hats—with the brown paper and string in which they had been wrapped still round them!

Advancing in this fashion for many miles, receiving the reports of scouts, the column kept formation. Suddenly, orders were given all along the lines to advance at a gallop, still keeping ranks. This gallop continued for about an hour. To rest their horses, many of the Pawnees would vault off the saddle and run beside the horse. Eventually they reached the side of a hill. Before them was a valley and beyond that another hill, intersected by many valleys. Down these intersecting valleys into the main valley came black torrents

of buffalo, headed that way by a hitherto unseen body of Pawnees. The combined effect of Pawnees behind and in front of them broke up the buffalo herds. Murray found himself shooting a large bull, which he only wounded. The bull then chased him, and only Murray's horse enabled him to escape. Riding along after his escapade, he met the noseless Iotan, who, not so lucky, had lost his horse and had been grazed himself. When Murray had shot his second bull, two young Pawnees of the Republican band rode up, and after some enticement, began to cut it up. They abandoned their task to try and wheedle more presents out of him. Murray refused, and sent them back to their tribe. So Murray had to cut up the animal himself. He had no sooner done this and packed it on the horse by means of thongs cut from its hide, when the horse itself bucked, knocked Murray down, scattered the meat over the prairie, and cantered after the Indians. From this predicament, Murray was delivered by yet another Indian, who rode up and obligingly chased the runaway, returning half an hour later. So Murray, caked in blood from his essays in butchery, returned to the camp, and delivered his hundredweight of meat at Sanitsarish's lodge for the squaws to pack.

On August 6 the camp moved southward. They could now see, at a great distance, the verdant fringe of timber which marked the upper Arkansas. Murray set about trying to acquire some more horses with which to return to Fort Leavenworth, but he confessed "I never, even among horse dealers, met with such impudent cheats and extortioners as my Pawnee friends. They knew that I *must* buy horses and determined to have their own price." The Great Chief of the Pawnees also came to Murray and offered him a horse in exchange for his stalking telescope. Murray, after much heart-buring, agreed to part with a treasure which he had used in Scotland and on the Alleghanies. The Great Chief did not honor his bargain, and Murray had to exercise great courage and presence of mind in securing the return of his telescope some hours later.

On the last day he spent among the Pawnees he saw a party of Delawares and Shawnees visit the camp on their way to the Rocky Mountains. Murray questioned them about the time taken them to ride from Fort Leavenworth, and they replied twenty-five. This hardened Murray's determination to return, so, with the help of Sanitsarish, he secured another horse. Vernunft too, had managed to secure one, a fiercer, more intractable animal. On these two mounts, accompanied by Murray's servant, and the young boy

they had brought from Fort Leavenworth, Murray and Vernunft set out in spite of pressing invitations to accompany the Pawnees to their winter camp.

They left August 8, on a morning more glorious than Murray had seen on the Atlantic. They had a false start however, for after travelling some twenty miles, Vernunft was thrown and trampled upon by his newly acquired mount. This necessitated a return to the Pawnee camp till August 11, when Vernunft felt well enough for them to start again.

This time, they had two Pawnee guides, but on August 14, they deserted him, influenced doubtless by the parties of Pawnees whom they met en route. So Murray undertook to guide his three companions back with the help of the sun and his compass. It was no sinecure. Everywhere steep ridges, irregular and broken, obstructed their progress. So he redirected his steps to the Snake river, where they camped for the night in a terrific thunderstorm. He held to a course north to north by east, in order to strike the Kansas River, which they did on August 21, after a week's travel. He was convinced that they crossed it by 50 to 100 miles lower than they had done when travelling out west with the Pawnees.

The two nights after they had crossed the Kansas River were the most miserable of all. The rain beat down upon them, and they had the greatest difficulty in making a fire. It literally washed away the last of their clothing: Vernunft was left with some washleather drawers and moccasins and a blanket, while Murray himself had a woolen nightcap, a shirt, a pair of coarse corduroy breeches, holed stockings and shoes.

On August 25, Murray had to make a decision. They met a large cross trail running at right angles to the course which they were taking. He was convinced that it was the trail which they had followed at the beginning of July, and was backed up by the American boy. His own servant, however, agreed with Vernunft, that it was not. So Murray decided to ride along it by himself for a short time and try and recognize some familiar landmarks. He had only ridden about two hundred yards, when he saw a white object in a bush by the side of the track. He dismounted, looked at it, and found it to be a scrap of the *London Times* newspaper. This gave them their direction, and from now onwards, their trials were merely those of endurance. They reached Fort Leavenworth on September 3, where Captain Hunter soon set them to rights and Murray became a civilized Englishman once more.

This did not end his Indian expeditions however. He stayed for some days at the Fort, visiting Kickapoo Indians and Potawatomes, to collect vocabularies of their language. Later, he went hunting with the Winnebagoes, and made a journey to the Alleghanies to visit the remnants of the Delawares. Later still, at Lake Oswego, he visited the country of the Mohawks. There, he had the pleasure of once more meeting Fenimore Cooper. He dined and spent the afternoon with "the Walter Scott of the Ocean", and recorded:

His house, both in size and appearance, looks like the parent of the thriving village in which it now stands. Before it is a circular lawn, now the scene of several pleasure garden improvements; beyond which the lake, with its wooded and verdant promontories, its sloping banks and the bold headlands which are at its upper extremities, forms a most agreeable landscape.

This journey, interesting as it is from Murray's account, published as *Travels in North America* by Richard Bentley in 1839, served as the basis for Murray's own essay into fiction writing: *Prairie Bird*.¹ His *Travels* reached a third edition in 1854, and this success must owe much to the hold which *Prairie Bird* established on the reading public.

The novel tells the story in true Fenimore Cooper fashion of two English families who emigrate to the edge of the paleface settlement. In the racial warfare waged between the advancing whites, against the retreating Indians, the daughter of one of these families is carried off by the Delawares. She is adopted by the great chief, and grows up as his adopted daughter. In the course of time, a son of the other emigrant family, Reginald Brandon (an allotope of Charles Murray himself), goes on a hunting expedition with an Indian party. This of course, was just what Charles Murray had done. On this Indian hunting expedition, he meets and falls in love with the adopted daughter of the great chief. Then begins a series of thrilling adventures, hardships and entanglements, that happily conclude with the explanation of everything.

What gives this novel added interest to the reader of Charles Murray's *Travels in North America* is its further autobiographical significance. For the *Prairie Bird* of the novel was none other than the daughter of James Wadsworth of Genesee, the highly successful

¹ *Travels in North America during the Years 1834, 1835, and 1836, including a Summer Residence with the Pannee Tribes of Indians and a Visit in Cuba and the Azore Islands*. Two volumes, 1839. (Revised, 1854). *The Prairie Bird*. Three volumes, 1844; 1845; 1857.

farmer whom Murray had visited on arriving in America. Wadsworth had taken no fancy to the young English blood, and forbade his daughter to communicate with him. By fictionalising his experiences, and casting her at Oolita, Murray could address her through the medium of the novel and testify to the undying nature of his affection.

The relationship, like that in the *Prairie Bird*, had a happy ending, however, for after fourteen years, James Wadsworth died, and Murray was able to marry her. By that time, Murray was well on the way to becoming a figure of consequence in the diplomatic world. He had become a groom-in-waiting to Queen Victoria and master of the household in the year before his *Travels* were published. By 1849 he had also held the offices of secretary of legation at Naples, and was holding the position of consul-general to Egypt.

It is a great pity that in the concentration of the historians upon the spectacular travellers like Harriet Martineau or Mrs. Trollope, such a judicious account as Charles Murray's has been ignored. President Van Buren wrote to Murray in 1836:

Casual visitors from your country to this are unfortunately so seldom desirous of seeing things here as they really are, or at least give themselves so little trouble to do so, and the right disposition in this regard having been so marked in you, I have, I confess to you, been not a little anxious about the result of your observations.

He need not have been. Another American, Waddy Thompson, read the *Travels*, and posthaste wrote to Murray: "I do not use too strong a word when I say to you that I love the man who can see everything in a foreign land as you have seen and described ours."²

W. H. G. ARMYTAGE

University of Sheffield,
England.

² The work was well received by the literary critics. "He has treated the manners and institutions of the United States with a very uncommon freedom from the prejudices either of nation or caste; insomuch that we have seldom, if ever, seen a more fair account of republican establishments and American society than is to be found in this work, written by the inmate of a court and a member of one of the noblest families in the empire." *Edinburgh Review*, LXXIII, 77-83; see S. Austin Alibone, *Critical Dictionary of English Literature*, London and Philadelphia, 1908, Vol. II, sub Murray, Charles Augustus.

Book Reviews

The Department of State: A History of its Organization, Procedure, and Personnel. By Graham H. Stuart. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1949. Pp. 517. \$7.50.

In this book Dr. Stuart has presented a comprehensive and objective study of the organization and development of the Department of State from its beginnings in 1789 to the present day. No comparable work has previously existed, and no one more competent could have undertaken to prepare such a study. The author's unique qualifications as an authority in this field are well known to students of American government.

The work is divided into thirty-six chapters, covering in chronological order the terms of office of the various Secretaries of State, the thirty-five who served a regular term of appointment or in an *ad interim* capacity prior to the Civil War, and the thirty-four since that time.

The beginnings of the Department of State under the Constitution stemmed from the Act setting up the Department of Foreign Affairs, which became law with the signature of President Washington on July 27, 1789. The functions of the Department were to the effect that the Secretary should perform such duties as the President might assign to him relative to correspondence, or negotiations with public ministers or consuls from the United States or from foreign states, and it was specifically provided that the business of the Department should be conducted "in such manner as the President of the United States shall, from time to time order or instruct." Since certain duties had to be performed correlating the Federal government with the States, and since Congress felt that the Department would not be over-burdened with work and could perform these domestic tasks as well, a bill was passed and approved by the President on September 15, 1789, changing the name of the Department of Foreign Affairs to that of Department of State and augmenting its functions. In addition to the duties pertaining to foreign affairs, the Secretary was now directed to receive from the President the bills, orders, and resolutions of Congress, and have them printed and copies delivered to each senator and representative, and the authenticated copies to the governor of each State. He was made custodian of the Great Seal of the United States and given authority to affix the seal to all civil commissions of officers to be appointed by the President. He also was given custody of all books, records, and papers that pertained to the Department. A budget of approximately \$6,000 took care of the financial needs of the Department of State, which included a staff of five or six persons, including the Secretary, a chief clerk, one or two other clerks, an interpreter, a doorkeeper, and a messenger.

The author describes step by step the growth and expanding functions of the Department up to the present time. Today it has a staff of over 6,000 persons housed in a number of buildings scattered throughout the National Capitol. The historical development of the administrative organization and method of operation of the Department, with its various

reorganizations, and its great expansion during and after the First and Second World Wars, is fully presented and objectively evaluated. Emphasis is placed upon the more recent period. Approximately two-thirds of the volume is devoted to the period since the Civil War, and approximately one half of the entire volume covers the period since World War I.

Perhaps a little more attention could have been given to the significant role of the Department during the last ten years in bringing the fields of international information and educational activities into closer relationship with the execution of American foreign policy. Many agencies, Federal and private, are participating in programs aimed to strengthen international cooperation through the interchange of knowledge and skills in technical, scientific, and cultural fields, and the Department of State is actively engaged in coordinating these efforts with the broad objectives of our foreign policy. An important aspect of this program is the facilitation of the interchange of students, professors, national leaders, and specialists in cultural, educational, scientific, and technical fields, thereby strengthening cooperative international relations by making possible an increasing number of person to person contacts between the citizens of friendly countries throughout the world. This has been made possible by various Acts and appropriations of the Congress. This technique in the field of foreign affairs represents a new and significant method of conducting the foreign relations of the United States.

In his concluding remarks the author states, with regard to the conduct of foreign policy:

"Public opinion must be informed and its support obtained. A democracy can achieve success in no other way. Never before in history have the problems of foreign policies been more difficult and acute than today, and never before has it been so essential that they be solved by peaceful means. Inasmuch as the primary causes of war are conflicts in foreign policy, our first line of defense is adequate machinery for the conduct of foreign relations. We need the best army, navy, and air force to support our foreign policy, but this policy must merit defense. It must be a policy so wisely formulated that its execution will appeal to the citizens as both reasonable and necessary."

This objective and well-balanced history of the organization, personnel and procedure of the Department of State, the agency of the Government primarily responsible for carrying out the foreign policy of the United States, will long remain the standard work on the subject.

J. MANUEL ESPINOSA

Washington, D. C.

Frederick Catherwood, Archt. By Victor Wolfgang von Hagen. Oxford University Press, New York, 1950. Pp. xix, 177.

This is the biography of a forgotten man. Famous in his own generation, and an associate of many of the notable men in his profession both in Europe and America, he has strangely become lost to posterity—until Mr. von Hagen currently revived his memory. After diligent searching for

the scattered records, the author has woven together the high points of Catherwood's life into a compact biography of less than one hundred and fifty pages. An appendix contains a reproduction of over forty of Catherwood's magnificent architectural drawings, principally of the Mayan ruins of Central America. These items together with an introduction by Aldous Huxley make an attractive and useful book distinguished by its bright style, roomy composition, careful notes and bibliography.

Catherwood's life reads like a tale of travel and adventure in forgotten corners of the world where he sought out the architectural relics of the past. Its span (1799-1854) coincided in time with the initial burst of enthusiasm in England and on the Continent for the new science of archeology. Many of the great persons in the new field dramatically crossed the architect's path as he travelled with drawing board and Camera Lucida through the ruins of Rome, Greece, Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Transjordan, and eventually the Mayas of Central America. For a time he lived in Rome where a fashionable coterie of his countrymen had an art colony and Lady Devonshire was making excavations in the Forum. He visited Athens shortly after Lord Elgin had plundered the Parthenon. He arrived in Egypt the year Champollion published the *Précis* on the Rosetta Stone. In America he became a friend of Prescott, then busy working on his *Conquest of Mexico*, and in Panama he met Schliemann who was still to discover the ruins of ancient Troy.

Apparently, however, even these activities could not contain Catherwood's tremendous energies. First in London, then in New York, he became a panoramist, a profession which drew large crowds before the days of movies to view such aberrations as poluphusikons and eidophusikons where the great scenes of the past and present as drawn by the artist could be viewed under the varying natural conditions of sunshine, rain, gloom, and storm, and "where the eye was pleased without the brain being duly exerted." Late in his life this amazing man showed his versatility by becoming a civil engineer. In this capacity he built a railroad in British Guiana, the first to operate in South America. Sick with malaria he went to California amid the fever of the gold rush. Even death came dramatically when his ship was lost at sea as he returned from an English visit.

The focal point of interest in Catherwood's biography is his adventure into Maya Land. In New York in 1836 the artist met John Lloyd Stephens, writer of travelogues, and together they learned of the Mayan ruins. Their first trip three years later took the two men to the ruins of the Old Empire of the Mayas where they made careful studies of Copán, Palenque, Quirigua, and other centers. The architect's drawings were "so scientifically accurate," according to Huxley, "that modern experts in pre-Columbian history can spell out the date of a stele from Catherwood's representations of its, to him, incomprehensible hieroglyphs." These became a part of Stephens's book of travel published in 1841.

On a second trip the two men went to Yucatán where they visited the centers of the Mayan New Empire at Uxmal, Kabah, Labná, Chichén Itzá, and other places. This time Catherwood published his drawings himself, and these plates with the artist's own introduction form an important part of von Hagen's volume.

This introduction is interesting because of Catherwood's shrewd guesses on the Mayas and their culture. He took issue with such contemporary writers as Kingsborough and Waldeck both on the antiquity of the Mayan civilization and its origin. He denied their contention that Mayan carving had its aparentation in the Old World. From his own knowledge of Near Eastern ruins he insisted that the Mayan work was influenced by neither Egyptian, Carthaginian, nor wandering Jewish tribes as these men believed. Moreover, his guess as to the antiquity of the ruins was more in accord with later than contemporary opinion. With all credit to Catherwood it must be admitted, however, that real advances in Mayan lore had to await the discovery of the works of the Spanish missionaries and explorers who had made careful studies of the ancient peoples, as Prescott had learned, but which lay so long in dusty archives unused.

PAUL S. LIETZ

Loyola University

Forgotten Patriot: Robert Morris. By Eleanor Young. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1950. Pp. IX, 280. \$4.

Few Americans have enjoyed so remarkable or chequered a career as Robert Morris. Among his distinctions were membership in the Pennsylvania legislature, election as a delegate to the Continental Congress, the signing of the Declaration of Independence, secretaryship of both navy and treasury under the new government, participation in the Constitutional Convention, signing of the Constitution, and membership in the first United States Senate, in which capacity he was largely instrumental in transferring the national capital from New York to Philadelphia, and eventually to Washington. During the Revolution he played a large part in establishing a navy, not disdaining the operation of a fleet of privateers which enriched him handsomely. But it is chiefly as the financier of the Revolution that he distinguished himself. Although his fiscal views did not prevail with Congress he strove mightily against the collapse of Continental currency and state paper money, even pledging his own fortune to secure loans and credit. Only when the inertia of Congress and the opposition of the States proved insuperable did he resign his office.

Morris' extraordinary business acumen was revealed early in his life. At first commerce and business absorbed his interest, but in time he turned to investment in public lands and urban real estate. Goaded by a mania which belied his otherwise good judgment he acquired millions of acres. Because of the inefficiency of one associate and the dishonesty of another he soon found himself in difficulty. His problems were multiplied by the failure of a London bank, some indiscreet building operations, and the general stringency. With property worth millions he could not borrow money, or sell or mortgage his possessions. Some lands were attached and sold for taxes or to satisfy creditors. Despite farcical efforts to evade creditors and sheriffs he was incarcerated, his indebtedness falling just short of three million dollars. The passing of the United States Bankruptcy Act

enabled him to regain his freedom after more than three and a half years of imprisonment.

In spite of his services during the Revolution and the following decade Morris never received due recognition, and consequently he is practically unknown. To rescue him from oblivion the author set herself the task of a new biography, based largely on the extensive documentary evidence unearthed since Oberholtzer's effort nearly fifty years ago. In her preface she states that her book is directed to the 'ordinary reader' rather than the scholar. Accordingly she has produced a fictionalized biography in which dialogue is invented to heighten interest, and free rein is given to her imagination in creating scenes and conversation. There are a few digressions of human interest, and numerous feminine touches; and phrases now current are resorted to for interest and piquancy. In general Morris is portrayed as the man of the hour, always superior and correct. There are no footnotes, but a few references are given in an appendix. These however are so general as to be useless to the scholar. This is a well written and sprightly biography, interesting and entertaining; but the definitive life of Robert Morris remains to be written.

CHARLES H. METZGER

West Baden College

Notes and Comments

The Ramparts We Guard is, like the preceding works of Professor R. M. MacIver of Columbia University, an exceedingly timely book. Published recently by The Macmillan Company it is not long in pages—119—but it is deep in import and highly encouraging in these days of wavering faith in our constitutional ways. The contents of the little volume are the substance of lectures delivered by Professor MacIver before the University of North Carolina in the Spring of 1949, and we must congratulate the publisher on getting these words before a wider audience. We have seen no discussion of our democracy which conceives its essence in such a solid American way. MacIver bases the American way on the traditional fundamental principles as established and developed by "our enlightened citizens" from colonial times to the present—stout, non-partisan, natural law, common law, constitutional principles. These are the yardstick, the democratic code, for judging the mistakes and misconceptions of administrators, politicians, rightists and leftists, who are in a way undermining our American ramparts. The thirteen chapters are an excellent definition of our democracy as distinct from any other, and as especially opposed to the communist type of totalitarianism. Individually, the chapters expose legislative trends toward establishing civil rights and equality of opportunity, the perils from false prophets, in fine, the security that lies within the traditional concept of a dynamic democracy. MacIver does more than issue a call to defend the ramparts of our nation—he demands that we make vital our faith, our wisdom, and our courage and assume the burden of our democratic heritage.

* * * *

History of the National Economy of Russia to the 1917 Revolution, by Peter I. Lyaschenko, was translated by L. M. Herman and E. L. Raymond, and published by Macmillan in 1949 through the instrumentality of the Council of Learned Societies. Lyashchenko is a "legal Soviet." His book has had the full approval of the Russian government and has now been put through a second edition, longer than this packed volume of 880 pages. His philosophy follows the Marx-Lenin-Stalin concept of history, so opposite to that described as ours by Professor MacIver. Into the communist mold the author has fitted a huge amount of data. Straining and

tugging at times he has evolved interpretations from the data, which are open to a far more natural interpretation. The mold, the facts, and the interpretations are those of the doctrinaire rather than the objective academician. As a result the reader must remain in doubt about both the data and its usage, since he cannot be certain that all of the facts are presented, especially those outside the field of the author's agrarian studies, and consequently cannot be certain of the validity of the assessment of the facts. It is only annoying to a sane scholar and stultifying to his intelligence to behold statements that many of the great inventions, as the incandescent lamp, the locomotive, had been perfected but not publicized in Russia long before they amazed the American public. But such ideas along with the materialistic concept of history are part and parcel of the heritage of "knowledge" brought to this country by Russian refugees of the last generation and taught to their children who are now in some high schools in our country and who will not believe otherwise than their parents. It would seem, that while there is a contribution in the book toward knowledge of the industrialization of Russia, the only purpose served by its presence is to have it as a sample of Soviet mentality in research and teaching, with which we incline to think America is fed up.

* * * *

James C. Malin has begun the second series of his Grassland Historical Studies. In 1946 and 1947 he published the first series on *The Grassland of North America* in volumes entitled *Essays on Historiography*, and *Prolegomena to its History*. The present series is to be in three volumes on the general subject of *Natural Resources Utilization in a Background of Science and Technology*. Volume I is *Geology and Geography*. In his Preface Mr. Malin says: "So far as I know, this is the first time that geology and the expansion of geological knowledge has been made an integral part of a major historical study. Part One has to do with Wood and Minerals for Fuel and Building Materials, especially in Kansas and Nebraska from 1830 to 1930. Part II is The Early History of the Town of Kansas (Kansas City, Missouri): A Case Study Fragment, History and Geography, covering the years 1850 to 1877. The book is an interesting contribution. It is in lithoprint from the typed pages, 377 in number, and is paper bound and sells for two dollars and a half. Copies may be obtained from the author at 1541 University Drive, Lawrence, Kansas.